

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 24, 1990

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In this our prayer, O gracious God, we remember those who know not the joy and satisfaction of a full life. We recall the hostages of every nation who are separated from those they love, who endure the pain and loneliness of their captivity. We pray, that as Your spirit crosses every barrier of time and place, so may our prayers give support and encouragement to all who are in need. May Your peace that passes all understanding unite us as one people and may we share together as one human family the joys and blessings of freedom. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 312, nays 89, answered "present" 3, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]
YEAS—312

Ackerman	Berman	Buechner
Akaka	Bevill	Bustamante
Alexander	Bilbray	Byron
Anderson	Boggs	Callahan
Andrews	Bonior	Campbell (CA)
Annunzio	Borski	Campbell (CO)
Anthony	Bosco	Cardin
Applegate	Boucher	Carper
Archer	Boxer	Chapman
Aspin	Brennan	Clarke
Atkins	Brooks	Clement
Barnard	Broomfield	Clinger
Bartlett	Browder	Coleman (TX)
Bateman	Brown (CA)	Collins
Bates	Brown (CO)	Combest
Bennett	Bruce	Condit
Bereuter	Bryant	Conte

Cooper	Kasich	Rinaldo
Costello	Kastenmeier	Ritter
Coyne	Kennedy	Roberts
Crockett	Kennelly	Robinson
Darden	Kildee	Roe
Davis	Kleczka	Rohrabacher
de la Garza	Kostmayer	Rose
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rostenkowski
Dellums	Lancaster	Roth
Derrick	Lantos	Rowland (CT)
Dicks	Laughlin	Rowland (GA)
Dingell	Leath (TX)	Roybal
Dixon	Lehman (CA)	Russo
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (FL)	Sabo
Downey	Lent	Saiki
Duncan	Levin (MI)	Sangmeister
Durbin	Levine (CA)	Sarpalius
Dwyer	Lewis (GA)	Savage
Dymally	Lipinski	Sawyer
Dyson	Livingston	Schaefer
Early	Lloyd	Scheuer
Eckart	Long	Schiff
Edwards (CA)	Lowey (NY)	Schneider
Emerson	Luken, Thomas	Schulze
Engel	Manton	Schumer
English	Markley	Sharp
Erdreich	Martin (NY)	Shaw
Evans	Martinez	Shumway
Fascell	Matsui	Shuster
Fazio	Mavroules	Sisisky
Feighan	McCloskey	Skaggs
Fish	McCrery	Skeen
Flake	McDermott	Skelton
Foglietta	McEwen	Slattery
Ford (MI)	McHugh	Slaughter (NY)
Ford (TN)	McMillan (NC)	Smith (FL)
Frank	McMillen (MD)	Smith (IA)
Frost	McNulty	Smith (NE)
Gallo	Meyers	Smith (NJ)
Gaydos	Mfume	Smith (VT)
Gejdenson	Michel	Snowe
Gephardt	Miller (CA)	Solarz
Geren	Mineta	Spence
Gibbons	Moakley	Spratt
Gillmor	Mollohan	Staggers
Glickman	Montgomery	Stallings
Gonzalez	Morella	Stark
Gordon	Morrison (CT)	Stearns
Gradison	Morrison (WA)	Stenholm
Grandy	Mrazek	Stokes
Grant	Murtha	Studds
Gray	Myers	Swift
Guarini	Nagle	Synar
Gunderson	Natcher	Tallon
Hall (OH)	Neal (MA)	Tanner
Hall (TX)	Neal (NC)	Tauzin
Hamilton	Nielson	Taylor
Hammerschmidt	Oberstar	Thomas (GA)
Hansen	Obey	Thomas (WY)
Harris	Olin	Torres
Hatcher	Ortiz	Torricelli
Hawkins	Owens (NY)	Towns
Hayes (IL)	Owens (UT)	Trafficant
Hayes (LA)	Oxley	Traxler
Hefner	Packard	Udall
Henry	Pallone	Unsoeld
Hertel	Panetta	Valentine
Hiler	Parker	Vento
Hoagland	Patterson	Visclosky
Hochbrueckner	Payne (NJ)	Volkmer
Holloway	Payne (VA)	Walgren
Houghton	Pease	Walsh
Hoyer	Pelosi	Washington
Hubbard	Penny	Watkins
Huckaby	Perkins	Weiss
Hutto	Petri	Weldon
Hyde	Pickett	Wheat
James	Pickle	Whitten
Jenkins	Porter	Williams
Johnson (CT)	Poshard	Wilson
Johnson (SD)	Price	Wise
Johnston	Pursell	Wolpe
Jones (GA)	Quillen	Wyden
Jones (NC)	Rahall	Wylie
Jontz	Ravenel	Yates
Kanjorski	Ray	Yatron
Kaptur	Richardson	Young (FL)

NAYS—89

Army	Goodling	Paxon
Baker	Goss	Regula
Ballenger	Hancock	Rhodes
Barton	Hastert	Ridge
Bentley	Hefley	Rogers
Bliley	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehlt	Hopkins	Roukema
Bunning	Hunter	Saxton
Burton	Inhofe	Schroeder
Chandler	Ireland	Schuetz
Coble	Jacobs	Sensenbrenner
Coleman (MO)	Kyl	Shays
Coughlin	Lagomarsino	Slaughter (VA)
Courter	Leach (IA)	Smith (TX)
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Smith, Denny
Craig	Lewis (FL)	(OR)
Crane	Lightfoot	Smith, Robert
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	(NH)
DeLay	Lukens, Donald	Smith, Robert
DeWine	Machtley	(OR)
Dickinson	Madigan	Solomon
Dornan (CA)	Marlenee	Stangeland
Douglas	Martin (IL)	Stump
Dreier	McCandless	Sundquist
Edwards (OK)	McCollum	Tauke
Fawell	McGrath	Thomas (CA)
Fields	Miller (OH)	Upton
Galleghy	Miller (WA)	Walker
Gekas	Moorhead	Whittaker
Gilman	Parris	Wolf
Gingrich	Pashayan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Clay	Frenzel	Green
------	---------	-------

NOT VOTING—27

AuCoin	Hughes	Nowak
Bellenson	Kolbe	Oakar
Bilirakis	Kolter	Rangel
Carr	Mazzoli	Sikorski
Conyers	McCurdy	Vander Jagt
Donnelly	McDade	Vucanovich
Espy	Moody	Waxman
Filippo	Murphy	Weber
Horton	Nelson	Young (AK)

□ 1425

Mr. UDALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GORDON changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 2.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 2, approving the Journal of Tuesday, January 23, 1990.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. SAIKI] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. SAIKI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the State of the Union.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Res. 228

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive five 1-minute speeches from Members on each side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT BUSH SHOULD USE HIS EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY TO UTILIZE VACANT FEDERAL PROPERTY TO RELIEVE THE PRISON CRISIS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I have great expectations for President Bush's upcoming State of the Union Address. Just over a year ago he stood in this body and said that his war on drugs would be waged on all fronts. But a year later the effort seems to be full of tangles.

On the frontline of the war on drugs, States and local communities, what does the President's plan do? It provides not one penny for the construction of local and State prisons. Convicted felons in 46 of 50 of our States are on waiting lists to serve their time.

Just last week, in my own district, four prisoners arrested for aggravated drug trafficking were released because there was no room for them.

The prison overcrowding situation has become a national crisis. Why cannot the President use his Executive authority to use vacant Federal properties to help us deal with this situation now?

I ask the President, when he comes next week before this body, to please provide the leadership to truly wage war against drugs.

The enemy, drugs, is everywhere and it is engulfing us.

CAMPAIGN REFORM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I was told when I returned to Washington that you had discussed campaign reform on a Sunday morning news show and promised that the House would take up a reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have devoted a good deal of time to campaign reform in this Congress. Our Republican Conference, the House Republican Conference, has adopted a set of proposals aimed at restoring some sense of integrity to Federal campaign practices, and it will be introduced shortly. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not under any delusions that the Republican bill, as good as it is, can be enacted into law. If you bring a purely Democratic bill to the floor, it will suffer the same ultimate fate.

□ 1430

If Members bring a purely Democrat bill to the floor, it will suffer the same ultimate fate.

However, by its very nature, campaign reform must be bipartisan. It is a partisan subject. True reform has to be bipartisan. This is not like budget reform or ethics reform, procedural reform, or a banking reform bill. Campaign practices are those which change the balance of power between one party and another. One party cannot change the rules of campaigning and then call it reform.

Mr. Speaker, I implore Members not to bring a Democrat bill to the floor and call it reform. I ask Members to reach consensus if possible, and then it will be reform.

I have gone the extra mile in this cause. I am not interested in a partisan exercise on the floor and some cosmetic gesture to the public demand for change. I am interested in seeing a campaign bill signed into law, and nothing short of that. I hope we will be able to work together in the best of spirit.

BUDGET PRIORITIES NEED LEADERSHIP

(Mr. HOAGLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great anticipation that we look forward to hearing the President's speech next Wednesday night. I hope, and I know we all hope that that speech will contain a budget that provides for authentic debt reduction. Last year's proposal from the White House was overly optimistic, as we all know, with respect to a number of assumptions, assumptions concerning economic growth and concerning in-

terest rates that threw the figures off by billions.

We need a budget, Mr. Speaker, without asset sales that do not materialize. We need a budget that does not contain so-called off budget financing. We need a budget without smoke and mirrors. The economic future of our Nation depends on our putting our economic house in order. We have substantial and inadequate savings and investments in this Nation. We have a gross balance of trade deficit. We must bring the deficit down. We are asking for leadership from the White House on this very important issue.

HONOR SERVICE MEMBERS

(Mr. PAXON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, this flag is a very special one. This flag was worn with great honor and great valor by a constituent of mine, Pfc. David "Chip" Turner while he was on duty in Panama during the recent invasion of that country.

Mr. Speaker, like so many others, Chip Turner served with valor because he was wounded in Panama during this operation. He was wounded while ministering to one of his colleagues whose wounds ultimately proved fatal.

My friend, like the hundreds and hundreds of others, thousands of others who served there, they deserve to be honored and recognized by this Congress for their duty on behalf of this country. They fought for freedom and democracy, and they fought the war on drugs in that faraway land. I am dismayed that as of yet, this Congress has not honored these men and women. This Congress has not recognized what they stood for, in Panama, and certainly has not stood up and honored yet the Commander in Chief whose leadership made possible this operation.

I hope before this week is out we will do just that.

HOPE FOR THE AMERICAN DREAM

(Mr. HAYES of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a week from today the President of the United States will stand back here and deliver the State of the Union Address. Mr. President, at a time of extraordinary changes in the world, I hope we would recognize that the reason that they have been brought about was because of the men and women in this country who have carried the great burden of leadership. I am not talking about any Member of

this body. I am not talking about any one person in particular.

However, as the leader of the free world, your recognition that it was the ordinary citizens whose example of the abilities to work hard to do well was the example that led to the crack in the wall. I hope when citizens receive the State of the Union, the President's plans for the future, I hope he recognizes that this is the person whose kid now needs to go to college, and that our plans include that. That this is the veteran who fought, who won, who led to the changes we are seeing today, but who cannot get all the health benefits, and our plan will include them. That these are the people who are bearing an unfair share of the tax burden, and your plans include some relief for them.

Mr. President, we talk of reaching out in bipartisan fashion. I assure Members that this Member of Congress on this side of the aisle is absolutely committed to continue the achievement of the American dream, and allow those who wish to work hard and do well, an opportunity to do no less.

NEED FOR BIPARTISANSHIP

(Mr. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a plea for bipartisanship. One of the reasons we do not get a good reputation in this body is petty partisanship.

Unfortunately this week, the Whip's Notice said that yesterday we were supposed to be working on a commendation for the soldiers that served in Panama. The reason we are not voting on it is that it was also asked to include the commander in chief of those soldiers. However, that was pulled. We are not going to be voting on it because it also would praise President George Bush who ordered those soldiers into service.

Now this reminds me that we have one of the Ten Commandments that talks about envy and covetousness. I close by reminding those who pulled that vote of commendation, an old English proverb: "Grudge not another what you cannot attain yourself."

INVEST IN EDUCATION

(Mr. OWENS of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, next week our self-proclaimed education President will present his new education budget. Ironically, some 50 million illiterate Americans are capable of reading the President's lips but

they are unable to read much of anything else. I want to challenge the President to truly be the education President. To end the rhetoric and make educational excellence a top priority. To hold a National Education Conference, as the White House did recently, and to refuse to discuss spending levels, made the conference almost irrelevant.

More than ever, America is challenged to keep pace with the technological advances and dynamics of the global marketplace. Our international industrial competitiveness is totally dependent on an educated, highly skilled workforce. Yet America's young spend less time on math and science than their foreign counterparts, and their test scores prove it. One of three high school students drop out before graduation. As a result, major scientific breakthroughs, almost all of which used to originate here, are now being developed elsewhere.

Let us get smart about education. Let us declare education's significance in the coming more technological world. Let us cut the defense budget, not only to reduce our crippling deficit but to promote economic strength by investing in critical education and research and development programs. American ingenuity needs a Federal commitment to put us back on top. Mr. President, we are anxious to hear your proposal.

PANAMANIAN SUCCESS DESERVES PRAISE

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, from our calendar I see we were to take up a resolution commending the service of U.S. personnel in Panama. I was looking forward to that. All America wants to express its thanks.

However, the resolution has been pulled from the calendar. The reason I am led to believe is the sponsors of the resolutions were unwilling to include the Commander-in-Chief among those to be commended.

If that is true, it is petty politics indeed. The operation in Panama was a great success, beginning with the decision to protect the American lives in the first place. All Americans performed in an exemplary fashion, and it is a sad day when we cannot commend our military personnel for their performance, and in some cases even sacrificed their life, because the President might get some credit, too.

I do not agree with the President all the time. I am not afraid to say so. By the same token, we and the overwhelming majority of Americans do agree we should not be afraid to say either, "Thank you, Mr. President,"

and thanks to the thousands of men and women who served this country so well in Panama.

LEADERSHIP EXPECTED FROM THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. NAGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago President Bush addressed a joint session of Congress.

He told us—and these are his words: "The people didn't send us here to bicker. It's time to govern."

He was right. But on this 369th day of the Presidency of the man who asked the American people to elect him because he'd be ready from day one to hit the ground running, it appears we need to also point out that the people didn't send us here to sit on our hands, either.

The list of issues George Bush talked about a year ago, but has done very little or nothing about since, is a long one: Education, the environment, homelessness, drugs, deficit reduction, improved trade competitiveness and a greater commitment to basic research. The list goes on and on.

I urge the President to use his State of the Union Address 1 week from today to start doing what only a President can do: Lead this great Nation.

If he didn't want to lead, why did he ask for the job in the first place?

Next Wednesday night, I think we cross the Rubicon. We've waited a year. The President needs to pick up that mantle, and start leading this Nation into some bold initiatives designed to improve the quality of life and raise the standard of living of the American people. Staying the same is not part of the American dream.

For 1 year, Congress has deferred to the President for leadership, for 1 year, that leadership has not been forthcoming. It is now clear: if the President won't lead, the Congress must. The American people expect their Government to be more than a disinterested bystander, at this time of enormous challenge for our country.

□ 1440

EXPRESSIONS OF APPRECIATION FROM THE ALOHA STATE

(Mrs. SAIKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SAIKI. Aloha, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Hawaii, I want to express my appreciation to those Members who came to my State over the recess to take a hard look at some of the problems in paradise.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we make no apologies for having sunshine and warm weather in January. I only wish

the media had paid more attention to the serious issues of international drug trafficking and the protection of our coastal areas.

By the way, aloha casual attire in Hawaii doesn't mean going native. It means common local business attire, not bermuda shorts and sarongs.

We of the 50th State deserve to have our concerns heard by congressional committees, and I hope more committees will hold hearings in Hawaii in the future.

I want to personally thank the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse for taking the time, trouble, and publicity to give the people of Hawaii a sense of hope and confidence that their concerns are indeed being heard by my fellow colleagues in Congress.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2273

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 2273.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair previously announced that it would receive five 1-minute speeches from each side. Further 1-minute speeches will be received later in the day.

EMERGENCY CHINESE IMMIGRATION RELIEF ACT OF 1989—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 101-132)

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H.R. 2712) to facilitate the adjustment or change of status of Chinese nationals in the United States by waiving the 2-year foreign residence requirement for "J" nonimmigrants.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO REFER OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves to refer the bill, H.R. 2712, and the President's Memorandum of Disapproval jointly to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions that the Committees consider the merits of the veto in light of events in China since passage of the bill and actions which the President has taken to protect Chinese students in the

United States and promptly report their recommendations back to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, may I say that yesterday, when I alerted the House that I intended to offer this motion, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, inquired as to whether or not this gentleman would yield half the time, as is the practice here at all times, to those who would oppose the motion, and I think their special request is that 15 minutes be yielded to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and 15 minutes to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I am noting that the chairmen of both of those committees are on the floor, and I would assume that is acceptable.

So, Mr. Speaker, to kick off the debate in support of the motion, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from my home State of Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2712, the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989. But I also support the motion offered by our distinguished Republican leader [Mr. MICHEL] to refer the bill and the President's memorandum of disapproval to the Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees.

I support that motion because it contains explicit instructions to those two committees to promptly report back their recommendations after considering the events and actions which have occurred since the bill passed the Congress last November. In this connection I noted with interest that the Judiciary Committee in the other body held a hearing on this veto yesterday. I think we owe the same to ourselves and the President before proceeding with a vote on reconsideration. However, should this motion to refer fail, I will support the veto override motion. To do otherwise would send the wrong signal. I think the President and Congress are both interested in protecting those Chinese students in this country. They only disagree on the means.

Mr. Speaker, in the time remaining, I want to make a few points about the procedural situation we are in because of its relevance to the future. This does not directly affect the substance of the bill but the process under which we in the House have to share concerns for the future.

To refer to the committee with instructions to report back promptly is in conformity with the constitutional mandate that Congress proceed to the consideration of the vetoed measure. Referring a measure to committee without instructions to report back

would leave the bill in a kind of legislative limbo, causing the kind of "uncertainty" in the public mind that the Supreme Court warned against in its 1929 Pocket Veto Case decision.

I have introduced legislation to ensure more congressional accountability on vetoed messages. H.R. 3462 would, among other things, require that immediately after a veto message has been read, the Speaker shall put the question on consideration of the vetoed measure, and no motion may preempt the previous question except one motion to postpone the override vote to a date certain, which shall not be more than 10 legislative days. Obviously, if the previous question is defeated, other motions would be in order, such as to table or refer.

Mr. Speaker, the second observation I would like to make is that while the President claims this was a pocket veto, he had the courtesy to return it to the Congress with his objections, thereby giving us an opportunity to vote to override. This is a departure from a minor bill he pocket vetoed in August, and I hope it indicates an accommodation with Congress on the pocket veto controversy.

As my colleagues may be aware, the administration is of the opinion that the President may pocket veto a bill at any time Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days, even when Congress has appointed agents to receive veto messages. The prevailing view in Congress is that he may only do so at the end of a Congress when he is truly prevented from returning a vetoed measure to Congress.

The Rules Subcommittee on Legislative Process, on which I serve as the ranking minority member, has reported legislation which attempts to clarify this issue. But, even if it is enacted it will only lead to more confrontation and litigation. It would be far preferable if the administration, by returning this bill, is signaling its intended practice in all future cases, since this in turn should obviate the need for legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I commend the President on returning this measure to the Congress with his objections so that we might exercise our constitutional prerogatives.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion to refer the President's disapproval message on the Chinese students visa legislation, H.R. 2712, to the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee has reviewed this matter in great detail. The bill itself has been considered three times by the House since the committee's deliberation and report to the House. On all three occasions, the bill has passed overwhelmingly. There is no debate on whether or not relief ought to be given to the Chinese stu-

dents who would be covered by its provisions. The debate focuses on whether the relief should be granted by legislative action by the Congress or by administrative action by the executive branch.

Further review of the substance of this legislation by the committee would serve no useful purpose except to delay a remedy which is needed now. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to refer this matter to committee so that we may proceed to vote to override the President's ill-advised veto of H.R. 2712 and enact its protections now.

□ 1450

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to refer H.R. 2712 jointly to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the Committee on the Judiciary.

This legislation has already gone through the traditional referral process in the House.

Under the rules of the House, it was clear at the time of referral that this legislation was exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Pursuant to rule X, the Speaker referred this legislation only to the Committee on the Judiciary because it amends the Immigration and Nationality Act.

If the legislation had contained matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we would have requested referral at that time.

Since that original referral, there has been no change in the substance of the bill which would warrant a new referral. This is simply an open attempt to delay, frustrate, or kill a bill which has already proven that it has the nearly unanimous support of the membership of the House.

This legislation deals with a waiver of a home residency requirement for holders of certain kind of visas. This is an authority under the purview of the Attorney General, not the Secretary of State. As such, it is a matter under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, not the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I urge the defeat of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], and at this time I alert my colleagues on the other side that, as the offerer of the motion, I will exercise my prerogative of closing the debate.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is engaged in a game of Chinese checkers, eager to jump over the President's pre-

rogatives in establishing, and maintaining and executing foreign policy. For that reason alone we ought to be supporting and voting for the motion that has been presented by the minority leader.

But, if that were not enough, consider the other elements of this proposition.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] insists, and I agree, that in his motion are contained references to committees which could look into the current developments on the mainland of China and with our direct relationships with the Chinese leadership. However, we want to criticize it for this action or that action.

My colleagues, it is imperative in these touchy times that the President of the United States be given latitude, discretion. I am not saying unfettered discretion. I am not saying loose ability to do anything he wants. But within the purview of establishing foreign policy discretion in the office of the President is paramount in the constitutional government that we have.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons I say, "Let's end this game of Chinese checkers. Let's resolve that it isn't necessary for the opposition to the President to show him up, to do one-upmanship on him, gamesmanship."

My colleagues, we are all in this together. We want to open the door to China. We want to give the students the right of remaining in this country, as does the President, but let us do it in the orderly, established manner which will do credit to the President and to the Congress at the same time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today, for all the world to witness, Congress will speak loudly where the President would only whisper. Today, Congress is standing up with strength and conviction to the forces committed to crushing the democratic movement in China.

Our vote to override the President's veto of the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act is not a vote to protect inspired partisan legislation. It is simply common sense.

A vote to override meets the absolute minimum standards of humanity and justice. It accomplishes what is obviously scrupulous. The very least we can do is affirm by law a principle which ought to go without saying: That the United States is a haven for those who face physical abuse and political oppression in their homeland.

Sadly, our President opposed that codification and vetoed our legislation. In doing so, he has sent a signal to the world that the implications of the brutality at Tiananmen Square are limited at best.

Today, we have an opportunity to repair that damage, to come to the aid

of the students who need our protection, and to let the Government of China be clear as to our commitment to the students who perished in Tiananmen Square in their struggle to see democracy flourish in China.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto, and I commend my colleague from California, Representative PELOSI, for persevering to see this important legislation through.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to clear up some misconceptions.

First, Mr. Speaker, there should be no doubt about the President's position. The day after the massacre at Tiananmen Square the President made a public pledge to protect the Chinese students who were in this country and said that not one of them would be forced to return home. He has kept his pledge. The President, in fact, has already acted. He has issued an administrative directive which, as we sit here, protects the Chinese students who are in this country.

I think the real question here is, "The students are protected; what's the rush to override the veto of the President?"

Mr. Speaker, it is said that we need to send a message to Beijing, but we have already sent a message to Beijing. We did that by a 403 to zero vote last November. In fact, we could not have sent a stronger message, so why the rush?

Mr. Speaker, frankly it sounds suspiciously like a "bash President Bush brigade" is on the prowl.

My colleagues, supporting the Michel motion does no harm to the Chinese students who are in this country, but it does allow the correct legislative process to work, and it does allow the President to exercise his rightful and constitutional foreign policy authority.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON].

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong support of overriding the President's veto of this legislation. H.R. 2712 would have eliminated the requirement that Chinese nationals return home for 2 years after finishing studies in the United States. Clearly, it is unsafe for these students to return to a regime that has so little regard for human rights. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, I think this veto would hand each and every student forced to return to China a prison sentence.

Even though the President has rightly issued an order waiving the return requirement, who is to say that

the administration will not unilaterally revoke the waiver some time in the future to placate Beijing. An override of the President's veto will give Chinese students the assurance that he won't and establish a human rights policy toward China that the White House will not.

Mr. Speaker, over the recess we discovered that U.S. envoys were secretly dispatched twice to Beijing, contrary to the spirit of the President's assurances to the American public. The President is now in the process of undoing his own sanctions and supporting a resumption of international bank loans to China.

Concurrent with these recent Presidential actions, China has stifled its media, severely limited demonstrations, and imposed strict censorship against foreign journalists. Furthermore, according to Asia Watch, in recent months 18 intellectuals were arrested because of their association with the democracy movement.

Frankly, I see little positive change in China. In fact, Chinese authorities have imposed tighter restrictions on demonstrations than were already in effect. Over 500 detainees were recently released, but thousands more still languish in Chinese prisons without charge or trial. These moves by the Chinese Government should be taken for what they are: a symbolic gesture meant only for international consumption.

Mr. Speaker, by overriding the President's veto of H.R. 2712, we will send a message to the Beijing government and to the White House that the Congress has a very different view of the situation in China. It is a well-founded perception that the administration was "kowtowing" to the Chinese Government by sending secret missions there. The administration is applying a double standard when it comes to human rights abuses in China. We need to reassess our strategic and commercial interests in China and should do so with its record on human rights in mind. The override of this veto places the United States on the side of the oppressed, not the oppressors.

□ 1500

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise, as I think we all will today, with the sense that none of us like to tell the President that we think he is wrong. It is never an easy vote to override a veto, but I believe in my heart, and I think most of the Members here do, that in this case the President is wrong. I know he has argued strongly that the administrative actions that he took are sufficient to see that the Chinese students who are in America

are protected and, indeed, he did take some very significant actions.

There are two problems with that argument. First, those administrative actions are subject to lawsuit and legal attack by other people in the country, class actions and what have you, and could be rescinded in those legal actions, in which case the Chinese students would be at risk.

Second, administrative actions can come and go. They do not have the force of law, and I think everybody here, or mostly everybody here, when they vote will show that they want these rules and regulations to have the force of law.

Let us put aside the legal arguments, because as important as they are, they are largely irrelevant when we put this entire issue in the context of the foreign policy and the message that we want to send not only to the leaders of China but to people all over the world, and we also have to look at this vote against the other actions that the administration, beginning on or about July 4 of last year, took with regard to the repressive regime in China.

Winston Lord, who previously was our Ambassador to China, testified yesterday in the other body to a committee, and he said this: "As a concerned citizen, I am generally against congressional micromanagement of foreign policy and the rigidities often introduced by tactical legislation." He said, "As a Republican who admires the President, served him, and applauds his overall foreign policy, I regret having to oppose the administration." Then he said, "This is the reality. Fairly or unfairly, the veto, if sustained, would reinforce the mindset and the mandate of those who have proceeded from massacre to repression, those who predict America will be lulled by cosmetic gestures and return to business as usual, those who dismiss the Chinese as a people apart from the global winds of change."

Whether we want to believe it or not, whether we want to accept it or not, this decision today sends a loud, clear message to the leaders in China about what we believe and what people all over the world believe about human rights, and it sends a message to the leaders in the Soviet Union, the leaders in East Germany, the leaders in Czechoslovakia, and in all the countries across the world that are in a state of change that business as usual is OK. I think we believe, I know I believe, that business as usual is not OK.

We have an obligation as Members of this Congress representing our people, as representatives of the American society that stands for human rights here and across the world, to unequivocally state what we believe about what these leaders did.

Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough to send leaders there 4 weeks after the acts in Tiananmen Square. It is not

good enough to send our top leaders there to clink champagne glasses 6 months after the acts. What kind of message do we want to send to the world? Do we want to say, "It is OK what you did?" Or do we want people to remember the single man who stood in front of the tank and said, "China must stand for democracy," and one man can stand up for those human rights.

Bobby Kennedy said, "If a single man plants himself on his conviction, the huge world will come round to him."

We have a chance today to bring America around to that man who stood alone in Tiananmen Square and said, "Democracy must come to China."

Vote not to refer this to committee and vote to override the veto and stand for human rights.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Michel motion.

A little bit earlier today, the President said at his press conference that if his veto was overridden it would result in a decision by China to retaliate against the United States by canceling many, if not all, of the academic exchanges between our two countries. If this assessment is, indeed, accurate, then it would clearly constitute a compelling argument in favor of the Michel motion and in favor of the effort to sustain the President's veto.

I believe, however, that the President's analysis is fundamentally mistaken. The leaders of China may be brutal, they may not be interested in human rights, but they are not dumb. They can read. Because they can read, they surely know that the protections provided in the President's own executive order for the Chinese students are roughly parallel to the protections provided Chinese students in the Pelosi bill. If the Chinese are going to retaliate because we pass the Pelosi bill, they will also retaliate because of the President's executive order. If this is the case, we might ask why then pass the bill.

We need to pass the bill because on the issue of China the President has lost his credibility. If the President can send some of the most senior foreign policy and national security officials in his administration to Beijing at the very same time that he is telling the American people that he suspended all high-level contacts, then he simply cannot be relied upon not to rescind the executive order at some point in the future if this veto is sustained.

In order to provide enduring guarantees to the 40,000 Chinese students in America who fear for their careers and

possibly even for their lives if they should be obligated to return, we need to defeat this motion and override the President's veto when the vote comes before us.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. President, we know you are popular because of foreign policy, but your policy on China stinks.

President Bush's veto of the Chinese student protection bill is wrong, wrong, wrong. It is wrong because it gives the wrong signal to the repressive Communist regime in Beijing, the butchers of Tiananmen. It is wrong because the Bush administrative directive is without any legal foundation and does not provide the Chinese students the protection they seek. It is wrong because it tells those around the world wanting freedom, run by repressive regimes, that the United States will sell them out for geopolitical reasons.

It is a shame that we kowtow to the Chinese with secret trips, winks, and pats on the back.

Mr. President, with all due respect, you are wrong on this one.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of overriding the President's veto of H.R. 2712, the Emergency Chinese Students Immigration Relief Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain none of us has forgotten the moving and historic scenes of last May and early June. Scenes of hundreds of thousands, indeed millions, of Chinese of all ages peaceably calling for reform of a corrupt and despotic government. Led by the brave students who occupied Tiananmen Square, the Chinese people rose and demanded a say in their nation's future. The Chinese Government's response was brutal and inhuman. The storming of Tiananmen Square remains one of the most terrifying events in modern times.

But as remarkable, tragic, and unforgettable as these events were, I am not certain the Bush administration truly remembers what took place in Beijing last spring—truly understands what the Government of China is capable of doing. We recently learned that weeks after the massacre, Gen. Brent Scowcroft traveled to China. This was followed by a second visit late last year. The President claims these visits were meant to underscore his concern regarding the Chinese Government's actions. If this was the case, why was it kept from Congress and the American people? Clearly, the events of last spring did not make a great enough impression on this administration.

The President further claims that his administrative directive is sufficient to protect the Chinese students. This directive, however, is without legal foundation and lacks the strength of law. Moreover, what is most frightening to the students is that the President's directive is discretionary and can be lifted at a moment's notice.

In light of the President's continued equivocation on this matter; in light of the adminis-

tration's pursuit of business as usual with China; in light of the administration's cozy relationship with the butchers of Beijing; any administration action aimed at protecting the Chinese students is suspect and should be regarded with the highest skepticism.

The President is concerned that this legislation will send the wrong signal to the Chinese Government. He could not be more incorrect. Overriding this veto sends a clear and correct message to Beijing—the United States stands alongside those who peaceably rise against oppression and cry out for democracy, and has no tolerance for governments which massacre those who peaceably demand change.

This is the message we should and will send, Mr. President. It is not the wrong signal; it is what this Nation stands for. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of overriding the President's veto and affording the Chinese students the protection they certainly deserve.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

□ 1510

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, although the President's Executive order technically may have accomplished much the same as our bill that the President vetoed, in practical point of fact the signal that it sent, the message that it sent, both to the murderous Mandarins running mainland China today with a cruel fist, as well as to the students in our country of Chinese descent who live in daily fear that they will be delivered forcibly to a vengeful Chinese Government, it was a message a world apart.

Our former Ambassador, our brilliant Ambassador to mainland China, Winston Lord, testified only yesterday to the Senate Judiciary Committee that, "There is no question that today Chinese students in the United States feel uncertain, uneasy, and vulnerable. It is best to remove all doubts by the unambiguous means of legislation. Those who have lived in China where laws do not protect the individual seek security in the laws of the United States that do. Passage of legislation would fortify the students psychologically as well as legally."

The Washington Post noted at the time of the President's veto that the Chinese have a word for that kind of gesture: "kowtow," the touching of the forehead to the ground in servile, supine acquiescence.

Mr. Speaker, that Presidential veto, that kowtow, sent a message that is demeaning to our country. Today we should wipe the slate clean and send a message loud and clear, not only to the Chinese students in our country, not only to the aging tyrants who made the decision that resulted in Tiananmen Square, but to people around the world, that we stand for freedom. We will protect these kids. That is the message we must send today.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote to override the President's misguided veto, for two reasons.

First, we simply cannot in good conscience force Chinese students in the United States on J visas to go home to face repression. Many of the students support the democracy movement and have spoken out loudly and vigorously against the evils of Communist dictatorship. The Chinese Government has harassed them here and their families in China. After June 3, it isn't hard to imagine what Beijing has planned for them if they come home. I assure you the American people want no part of it, and rightly so.

Second, Mr. Speaker, there is an important institutional aspect to this issue. The President says we have no constitutional right to reconsider this bill because he has "pocket-vetoed" it. In his message Mr. Bush claimed that the adjournment of Congress "prevented" him from returning the bill within the meaning of article I, section 7 of the Constitution. He also claimed that by withholding his approval he had "precluded" it from becoming law, but that he was returning it to the House because of court decisions raising questions about when the pocket veto applies.

The courts have ruled a President may not use a pocket veto during adjournments within or between sessions of Congress. However, the administration refuses to accept these rulings. The Justice Department testified at a hearing last year in my subcommittee that the President can pocket veto a bill whenever its House of origin is adjourned for more than 3 days. This is absurd. Surely there is no Member of this House who believes that a President should be able to pocket-veto bills over a long weekend, but that is Mr. Bush's position. My subcommittee recently approved legislation codifying the court rulings, which we intend to bring to the floor very soon. I hope all Members will support it.

Mr. Speaker, Congress clearly has both the constitutional right and the moral duty to override this veto today. Democracy is breaking out all over the world. Let's not support the forces of darkness, brutality and repression by sending these students home. Let's show the world this Congress stands up for freedom. Let's show the White House this Congress stands up for its rights under the Constitution. Let's override this veto.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the minority whip.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my leader for yielding me the time. I am going to vote to override the President's veto today. I announced that last week. I feel that Members do have a constitutional obligation to do that.

I am also going to vote for the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. I want to explain briefly why I think it is reasonable to spend a week or two asking the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Intelligence and other committees to review things.

I found myself just as we prepared to come back home and we were all out around the country, we were looking around and talking to people. As I sat in Douglasville, GA, in Carrollton, GA, in Jonesboro, GA, I had a chance after Christmas to listen to people.

Then I said, now we are all going to come to Washington. It suddenly occurred to me one afternoon, and I think this is an important thing for Congress to realize, that the world had changed dramatically since we left here in November. Romania had lost its dictatorship in an extraordinarily bloody cycle of events. The Soviet Empire changed substantially. The Azerbaijani rebellion all occurred since then. The process of change in Panama had been decisive with an American victory and a victory for freedom and against the drug dealers. Place after place around the planet, things changed.

In China there is a process going on. I thought what could better illustrate the willful ignorance of Congress than to rush back to Washington, and within 24 hours of arriving, decide that it could not stop and investigate, it could not have closed hearings to receive any testimony by the administration, it could not contemplate; but instead, relying on newspaper reports, relying on Christmas cards from Chinese students, relying on the passions of the moment as we remembered it the day we left, when we voted.

There is no question in my mind that the President has made a mistake. There is no question in my mind that in fact if we are going to vote to override the veto, it should be an override.

I just found it intriguing that we had to schedule this the opening week and that it had to be characterized by some people as a partisan scheduling on the part of the Democratic leadership to score one on the President.

Let me just say two things in closing about all this: In the first place, a man with 80-percent approval can probably be overridden and he will not be crippled dramatically. He might shrink to the levels of Roosevelt, to the more normal levels of Eisenhower and Roosevelt. In the second place, we will not dramatically change things.

I just want to note for my colleagues, I hope the Democratic leadership does not plan to start a whole series of partisan snipings, of which this week's schedule is an example. I think it is regrettable that they pulled the resolution on Panama, which should have been here and we understood yesterday was going to be here. I think that would have been bipartisan and positive and the American people would have supported it.

I think it is regrettable that it was decided to schedule this, and that it has been described so openly in the press as a partisan effort.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this motion on two grounds. First, to send the signal that on an issue that is still going to be relevant in 2 weeks, an issue where the President already personally by administrative fiat has taken care of any concerns of the students, has already protected them, that it would not have been inappropriate for Congress to wait 2 weeks to let the committees report. And the truth is the committees could not have reported during the previous period because they were not here. They could not have gotten a quorum and had a meeting.

Symbolically, first I think it is useful for the legislature to try to be informed occasionally, especially when the world is changing as fast as it has in the last 60 days.

Second, I want to send a message to my friends in the Democratic leadership. It is going to be a long season if we get to petty partisanship, if we pull a resolution on Panama that should have commended the President of the United States, that should have applauded the men and women in uniform who did the right thing, if we pull that and leave standing only a veto override in the narrowest of partisan ways.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my friends on the Republican side will vote for this motion, and those Democrats who think Congress should slow down and take a look and get briefed occasionally, they may want to vote this way too.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in these past few months we have seen historic images of change and courage and hope. We have seen the image of free people celebrating on the ruins of the Berlin wall. We have seen, too, the image of a young Chinese man facing a convoy of tanks in an act of defiance that spoke for all mankind. And we have seen the darker image of American diplomats lifting a cynical toast to the brutal Communist ideologues who had crushed the life out of their brightest children.

Today we have the opportunity to create another image—as we, representing the sentiment of a Nation, re-

affirm through law the basic decency of the American people, and the basic fairness of our moral imperative. Let us send a clear and simple marker about the American character to the butchers of Beijing.

In doing so, we will also send to freedom loving people throughout the world an unequivocal message: we stand for human rights. Let us defeat the motion to refer, let us override this unfortunate veto, and let us lift no more toasts to tyrants.

□ 1520

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion which I think is well intended and I understand the minority whip's proposition that we could take 2 weeks to look at this. There is, though, I believe no one in this body who believes that looking at this in 2 weeks would change the opinion of any Member of this body who represents the people of this country who were outraged, justifiably so, by the events in Tiananmen Square.

I suggest to you that perhaps people told Andrei Sakharov to wait, take 2 weeks to consider whether human rights violations were worth standing up against. Perhaps the people in Rumania were told that as well.

Vaclav Havel, who spent 5 years in prison in Czechoslovakia, I am sure was told many times, "wait."

It is time to act now, it is time, with a clear and I hope unanimous voice, state to those in China as we have done over and over again, not on a partisan fashion but together, the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc in Europe, "We stand in united opposition to violations of human rights in the Soviet Union."

Indeed our President, President Reagan said that the then Soviet Union at the time he said it was the evil empire. It is perhaps China that now stands most dramatically in that position.

This is not a time to temporize, this is not a time to delay, it is a time to act. Let us speak with a strong voice and override this misguided veto.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her leadership on this bill. Her dedication to bringing this important bill back to the floor is greatly appreciated by us all.

This vote to override President Bush's veto is a vitally important step

in continuing this country's commitment to democracy around the world. The United States, as the leader of the free world, must show to our neighbors that our promise to those fighting for freedom is expressed in actions and not just words. We have a long standing commitment to be a haven for those fleeing repression. This vote is an expression of that promise. As such, I am proud to voice my support for a bill that will allow Chinese students to stay in this country. I urge my colleagues to join forces in overriding President Bush's veto of this imperative legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the President: Mr. President, your approval ratings may be skyrocketing, but that will not stop Congress from doing the right thing on the Chinese student visa issue. This House and the American people will not stand by and watch these students returned to the butchers of Tiananmen Square should your administrative remedies fail.

We in Congress respect your desire to maintain flexibility in conducting foreign policy. But we do not believe that the thousands of Chinese students in the United States should be pawns in an international game of chess with China.

This country was electrified by the courage and passion of the throngs of students who took on their repressive government and its tanks. With their efforts for reform brutally smashed, these students deserve our assurance that they will not be returned to their oppressors.

Congress gave that assurance by passing H.R. 2712. Mr. President, your veto of the bill has sent the opposite message.

Now is not the time to flex your muscle in the name of executive discretion. Now is the time to send a clear signal that the United States will not tolerate repression; that the United States will stand firmly behind the courageous men and women who struggle for freedom around the world.

You may be willing to gamble that your administrative remedies are sufficient. But if they are not, Mr. President, you would have to stand up and tell each Chinese student that they will have to go back to horrible repression because you guessed wrong.

Only by enacting H.R. 2712 will we ensure that these students do not become sacrificial lambs at the hands of those who bloodied Beijing.

Mr. President, pave the way to better relations with the Chinese Government, but not on the backs of their students. I urge my colleagues to override the President's veto and enact H.R. 2712.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The Chair will remind Members that under the rules they must direct their comments to the Chair and only to the Chair, and not directly to the President in the second person.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER].

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I thank the Chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of who favors deporting Chinese students to China and who does not. No one favors that. That is not the President's policy and to suggest that it is would be unfair to the President.

I think the issues are more subtle than that.

Our Government policy really should have two objectives: No. 1 to change Chinese behavior and number two to continue this relationship between the two countries.

There are really two approaches: First is the President's approach which is the carrot approach; the other is the congressional approach which includes tough sanctions.

I think both approaches are very difficult to make work. I do not know whether either approach can work. I do not know whether the President's policy or the policy enunciated by the Congress in this override effort can change Chinese behavior. I think the Chinese may in fact react against congressional pressure. But what I do think is that the Chinese cannot really moderate their behavior.

I think therefore the President and the Congress are fooling themselves when they suggest the Chinese can moderate their behavior when either a carrot or a stick is applied.

If the Chinese do moderate their behavior, if they let this genie out of the bottle they know it is all over for them.

Once democracy begins to spread in China I think that genie cannot be put back in the bottle. Therefore, I think it is in our interest to recognize that change is coming. Democracy is coming to China. Nobody knows how long or how soon it will be, but when it comes let it be said that America stood with the students and with democracy in China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], has expired.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has 3 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], has 17½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Illinois has the right to close debate.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak against the motion to recommit and in strong support of the override.

Mr. Speaker, it is disgraceful that Congress must even consider overriding a veto on an issue as basic as the health and safety of the Chinese students in the United States. Sadly, however, the administration has turned a cold shoulder to their fate.

Without the waiver created in this bill these students, upon completion of their studies, will be required to return to China, a country that still has not expressed remorse over the killing of hundreds of its own people. Defeat of the override can only mean two things: The students will have to go home to a dangerous welcome or risk staying in America illegally.

I cannot imagine imposing such a harsh and unnecessary fate upon the students.

Has the American sword of justice become so blunted that we will not afford simple physical protection to thousands of innocent people? Mr. Speaker, the time has come to stand up for democracy. The time has come to stand up for the brave young Chinese students who were massacred in Tiananmen Square.

The time has come to stand up to the President and to override his veto on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to send unequivocally, on a bipartisan basis, a message to the people of China that both Democrats and Republicans alike, people from throughout America, regardless of political persuasion, support the aspirations of democracy in China, support the students who supported democracy in China and reject the brutality that was seen in Tiananmen Square.

□ 1530

Only by overriding this veto, and only by refusing to send this bill back to committee can that message be so demonstrably communicated, as it must be.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining, and yields 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, today's task is simple. We choose between freedom and liberty on one side, tyranny and murder on the other. Today we tell the Chinese leaders that America does not stand for government-sanctioned murder. Unfortunate-

ly we must also send this message to the White House.

When we talk about the leaders of China, let's be clear. We are talking about murderers. We are talking about those who ordered the tanks to run down and gun down students. We are talking about those who want Chinese students returned from this country so that the Chinese version of fair punishment—murder—can be carried out.

George Bush is wrong when he says he can deal with these tyrannical murderers using reason and diplomacy. You can't reason with mad dogs, Mr. President. You can't respond to the flowing blood of dead students with a toast of red wine.

The President is wrong. We know it, the American people know it.

Vote for the veto override. Save the President from his mistake. Save the Chinese students. And save America from sanctioning tyranny and murder.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding time to me. I rise to review the issues. There are two issues before Members today. One is of substance; one is of symbolism. On substance, this is the strangest, most peculiar veto override circumstance in the memory of this Member. Congress passed a bill to implement a narrow change in immigration policy relating to Chinese students in this country. The President, by Executive order, implemented the policy but vetoed the legislation. In one sense, the veto was gratuitous; in another sense, the override effort is equally gratuitous. In a policy way, the result is the same, whatever the override result.

In a more positive sense, it is key to note that both the executive and legislative branches have good reasons for their actions. Congress passed compassionate legislation. The President had a very thoughtful reason to veto that legislation, his concern not only for students in this country at this time, but that we might not be able to obtain future students based on exchanges.

I stress the good intentions all around because at a symbolic level, some suggested that the veto override represents a quasi-vote of no confidence on the President's policy. I believe this vote should not be considered in that context. As a Member who believed Congress was right to pass the Pelosi bill, that the President was justified to veto it, but Congress nonetheless, correct in moving to override; I would like to stress that the balancing factor is the appropriateness of Congress taking the lead role in immigration policy, and the necessity of this body as a barometer of American values not being coerced by octogenarian oppressors in Beijing.

As for the President's broad demarche, I am convinced partisans are premature in criticism. In this regard, this body should not underestimate that modest, positive results appear to be unfolding. In the wake of the Scowcroft visit, Beijing agreed not to sell M-9 missiles to the Middle East, lifted martial law, agreed to reallocate the presence of Voice of America in China, it commenced discussions on a wide range of Fulbright and Peace Corps programs, and released a small number of political prisoners. Skeptics are correct in suggesting that fundamental changes have not occurred. However, in all likelihood, without President Bush's bold gambit, none of the above would have happened. Good news is good news, even if it is not extraordinarily good news.

In this context, there is one aspect of the Scowcroft mission that I want to stress above any other. This week, serious negotiations are under way among members of the Security Council of the United Nations, to secure an international solution to the Cambodian issue.

Without the Scowcroft visit, serious cooperation with the Chinese, who hold not only a veto in the Security Council, but the most powerful card in Southeast Asian politics, would be impossible. Because of the Scowcroft mission there is a possibility, albeit slim, of an international breakthrough to prevent Pol Pot from returning to power. Because of the Scowcroft visit there is also a powerful prospect that a cooperative model could be established for Third World intervention in a peaceful way in other settings.

Given Chinese history, I think all Members in this body should understand that for the majority to be too critical of an effort to maintain direct, high-level contact with senior Chinese leaders is ironic if not dangerous. It is ironic because liberals for 20 years insisted on public recognition and diplomatic intercourse with the Mao Zedong's China, and now object to serious quiet discussion with Deng Xiaoping's government.

It is dangerous because Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge are today closer to achieving a decisive military and political advantage over the militarily inept Cambodian Government of Hun Sen.

To conclude, I would like to emphasize that on the narrow issue of immigration policy, philosophically this veto override might be considered to reflect a healthy competition between coequal institutions of government as well as political parties. In a sense it may be seen as a celebration of a healthy aspect of American politics, a bipartisan and bi-institutional desire to do right by 73,000 Chinese students, especially the 40,000 among them who hold "J" visas.

However, I stress that competition for good government can contain seeds

of destructiveness if Members of this body, particularly the majority, play politics with the broader aspects of the administration's admittedly high risk policy. My own sense is that the wise, thoughtful approach today is to give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] the benefit of the doubt, to bring this issue back to the floor in a more consistent, coherent, and bipartisan fashion, but under any and all circumstances, this body is going to have to make it clear to the Chinese students that we will stand behind them.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, history will reflect that Ronald Reagan was the best American President Japan ever had. They truly loved him. I say here today if President Bush's veto is sustained, President Bush will be remembered as the greatest American President that the Chinese Government ever had. Not the people of China, but the Government. The Government that murdered innocent people, who sought freedom. They shot them down. They have put thousands in jails. What is even worse, what flies in the face of this debate, until this day the Chinese Government will not even admit the massacre, nor admit the fact that they have detained illegally so many Chinese citizens.

Now, maybe our President is going to kowtow to a repressive Chinese Government, but this Congress should not. It is time to put your vote where your rhetoric is. If America stands for self-determination, it stands on the side of people who seek freedom, then we override this veto today. Anything short of that is un-American.

I commend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her fine effort, and the respective chairmen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am not altogether sure it was in my best interest to yield the extra minute to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. However, I will give Members a much more rational argument why Members ought to support my preferential motion here today, and in the event that it does not pass, I want to make it quite clear that I will be voting to sustain the President's veto of the legislation.

I am going to begin my remarks here with a quotation which is not my own, but is very appropriate for the occasion.

It reads as such:

There are many practical reasons why the President must keep in contact with the present Chinese leadership no matter how distasteful such contact is for himself and the other American people. There is simply no other alternative if we want to get things done. By maintaining contact the President cannot right the wrong that has already been done but he may be able to prevent that gang of power-mad old men in Beijing from inflicting more madness on the Chinese people and the civilized world.

□ 1540

Mr. Speaker, the words I have just read are not, as I said, my own. They are the words of Nien Cheng, author of "Life and Death in Shanghai," a memoir of her survival as a prisoner of the Chinese Communist Government.

I do not know where Nien Cheng stands on the bill, H.R. 2712, but her words remind us that what is at stake here is not just an immigration policy but the way the United States conducts foreign policy.

I am glad, at long last, to see universal concern for human rights in China. When we opened relations with the China of Chou En Lai and Chairman Mao, those who told us of the tens of millions of innocent victims of Chinese Communists were scorned as not being "pragmatic." But because of foreign policy considerations, we went ahead and established relations with the bloodiest dictatorship in the world, and many of those now criticizing President Bush applauded the opening to China of Chairman Mao and Chou En Lai.

I mention this only to clarify a point that I am sure will be made later on in the debate on the actual veto message.

Some who want to override the President's veto will say that the President is insensitive to the Tiananmen Square massacre, but under our system an American President has to keep in touch with friend and foe alike, and some may be down right bloody dictators.

In 1941 Stalin had more innocent blood on his hands than Hitler, but President Roosevelt embraced him at the time in the long-range best interests of the United States.

Well, you might say: "But that was war."

I say that our relationship to China will have a bearing on the next 50 years of world history. We have to keep the lines of communication open and let those who decried the opening to China on human rights grounds cast the first stone. Let those who say we should not have embraced bloody Stalin lecture to us on morality.

I voted for H.R. 2712 with the overwhelming majority of our colleagues because the principles at the heart of our bill reflected our universal desire to help the Chinese students in the United States.

Incidentally, I do not know how many other Members out there re-

ceived as many Christmas cards from Chinese students around the country at the various universities as I did—they were very touching—thanking us for what we had done. They have a real network in this country, and I appreciated their taking their time to send Christmas cards in appreciation for our expressing our point of view.

It was a magnificent gesture of compassion and concern for us to have adopted the legislation initially, but fine gestures are not substitutes for sound policy.

Some may argue that the situation in China is still bad, and of course it is. No one is denying that. My point is not that things are better, only that they are different and more complex with the passage of time, and we owe it to the American people to analyze the differences. No Chinese students in the United States and no principle of human rights will be sacrificed by a thorough re-examination of the current situation. It may well be that after such an examination we could decide to take different, perhaps even more wide-ranging action. And let me repeat—there will be no danger to the Chinese students if we take a second look. They are already protected by the President's directive.

Principled, effective foreign policy demands commitment to the long run, to hard work, often behind the scenes, sometimes involving compromise, sometimes involving confrontation. It sometimes involves, frankly, holding your nose with one hand while extending the other.

President Bush knows China, I would say, as well as, if not better than, any Member of this House of Representatives. He knows her people. He knows their special traits, and he must be given the room to make the foreign policy moves he feels are in the long-range, best interests of our country.

Since the goal of the President and of the Congress is the same, that is, protecting the Chinese students, and since the students are now protected, why not take the extra time and effort to re-examine what we have done?

Surely we owe it to the Chinese students and to the American people to show that democratic government involves the willingness on the part of the Legislature to admit it can perhaps do a better job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask support for our motion to refer this matter to both the committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD three letters reflecting the views of 22 Chinese-American organizations in support of the President's veto.

JANUARY 22, 1990.

HON. GEORGE MITCHELL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: We applaud and support the President's decision to withhold

approval of H.R. 2712, the "Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989."

The relationship between the United States and China has been difficult since June 1989 and the positive steps taken by President Bush to normalize relationship with China is serving the best interest of this nation. An override of the Presidential veto at this time will definitely send the wrong message to the leadership in China about American intentions. It will also complicate a very sensitive situation, not to mention the negative effect of limiting the President's ability to conduct diplomacy.

We strongly believe that the Presidential Directive makes H.R. 2712 totally unnecessary. We also believe that the Presidential Directive provides broader and better protection for the Chinese students. We also oppose legislation that put America in a straightjacket and Congressional actions that limit options available to the Executive Branch in responding to changing circumstances.

The President has acted in the long term best interest of America. We urge Congress NOT to override the Presidential decision to withhold approval of H.R. 2712.

Sincerely,

Samuel T. Mok, Hun J. Goon, Lawrence T. Tom, Yen-Den A. Chen, the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association of Washington, DC.

Alfred Hong, Chinese American Citizen Alliance.

Barry Tien, New Jersey Asian American Political Coalition.

Julie Rao, Asian American Congressional Forum.

Robert Kwok, Chinese American Music Society.

Heo-Peh Lee, Chinese American Political Action Association of New York.

Grant Moy, attorney, Bethesda, MD; Rev. Man-King Tso, Baptist Church, Georgetown, Wash., DC; Rev. Jonathan Liu, Chinese Bible Church, Rockville, MD; Daniel Ho, professor, Wash., DC; Patrick Sung, attorney, Arlington, VA; Dr. Robert Kwok, M.D., Silver Spring, MD; Eleanor Wang, businesswoman, Annapolis, MD; Homer Chen, engineer, Wash., DC; Dr. Grace Shu, Williamsport, PA; Dr. Robert Hsueh, attorney, Dallas, TX; Professor Chi Wang, Wash., DC; Nelson Lee, businessman, Silver Spring, MD.

THE GUANGDONG BENEVOLENT
ASSOCIATION OF GREATER WASHINGTON,
Washington, DC, January 19, 1990.

HON. GEORGE MITCHELL,
Senate Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MITCHELL: The Guangdong Benevolent Association of Greater Washington and the following organizations wish to convey to all the United States Senators a message. The organizations are:

Chinese American Communities of USA.
National Association of Chinese Americans, Washington, DC.

The Fujian Residents Association, Washington, DC.

Associated Organizations of Chinese American Heritage, Washington, DC.

American Center for Medical Sciences.

American Chinese Freemason Society.

Moy's Association.

Chinese American Chamber of Commerce, USA.

The Gee How Oak Tin Association.

China Reunification Alliance, Washington, DC.

KiangSu Residents Association.

The message is a simple one.

We believe the President did the right thing when he withheld approval of the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989. We also believe that an override of this Presidential decision will not serve the best interest of United States, China, and the Chinese students in this country. As Chinese Americans, we speak with compassion for these students. As American taxpayers and voters, we speak with the interest of United States in mind. An override will endanger longterm relationship between China and the United States. It will also mislead the Chinese Government about the intentions of the American people and their perception of President Bush.

Please DO NOT allow the override of the President's decision on H.R. 2712 to take place.

Respectively,

DOUGLAS TOY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 22, 1990.

PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH

The White House, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing this letter to support your position and policy regarding the Chinese students present in the United States. We know you would never allow any action that would force the return of Chinese students if their lives or liberty are in danger. We know you have firm commitment and are supportive of the humanitarian principles that Chinese students are fighting for. We think your Executive Order provides immediate and broader protection than H.R. 2712.

Therefore, we strongly support your memorandum of disapproval issued on November 30, 1989. You have a long record being a supporter of fighter for human rights. We firmly believe that you and America will always stand with freedom-loving men and women around the world.

Respectfully yours,

Dallas Asian-American Chamber of Commerce.

Dallas Asian-American Voters Coalition.

Chinese Lions Club.

Chinese Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the preferential motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 137, nays 276, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—137

Archer	Bartlett	Billiey
Armey	Barton	Broomfield
Baker	Bateman	Buechner
Ballenger	Bentley	Bunning

Burton	Hiller	Ravenel
Callahan	Holloway	Regula
Chandler	Hopkins	Rhodes
Clinger	Horton	Ridge
Coble	Houghton	Ritter
Coleman (MO)	Hunter	Roberts
Combest	Hyde	Robinson
Coughlin	Inhofe	Rogers
Courter	Ireland	Ros-Lehtinen
Craig	James	Roth
Crane	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Dannemeyer	Kyl	Schaefer
Davis	Leach (IA)	Schiff
DeLay	Lent	Schulze
DeWine	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Dickinson	Lewis (FL)	Shaw
Dorman (CA)	Lightfoot	Shays
Dreier	Livingston	Shumway
Duncan	Lowery (CA)	Shuster
Edwards (OK)	Madigan	Skeen
Emerson	Marlenee	Slaughter (VA)
Fawell	Martin (IL)	Smith (NE)
Fields	Martin (NY)	Smith (TX)
Fish	McCandless	Smith, Robert
Frenzel	McCollum	(OR)
Galleghy	McCrary	Solomon
Gallo	McEwen	Spence
Gekas	McGrath	Stangeland
Gillmor	McMillan (NC)	Stearns
Gingrich	Meyers	Stump
Goodling	Michel	Sundquist
Goss	Miller (OH)	Tauke
Gradison	Moorhead	Thomas (CA)
Grandy	Morrison (WA)	Thomas (WY)
Grant	Myers	Upton
Gunderson	Nelson	Walker
Hammerschmidt	Oxley	Weber
Hancock	Packard	Weldon
Hansen	Pashayan	Whittaker
Hastert	Paxon	Wolf
Hefley	Petri	Wyllie
Herger	Quillen	Young (FL)

NAYS—276

Ackerman	Crockett	Hefner
Akaka	Darden	Henry
Alexander	de la Garza	Hertel
Anderson	DeFazio	Hoagland
Andrews	Dellums	Hochbrueckner
Annunzio	Derrick	Hoyer
Anthony	Dicks	Hubbard
Applegate	Dingell	Huckaby
Aspin	Dixon	Hughes
Atkins	Dorgan (ND)	Hutto
Barnard	Douglas	Jacobs
Bates	Downey	Jenkins
Beilenson	Durbin	Johnson (SD)
Bennett	Dwyer	Johnston
Bereuter	Dymally	Jones (GA)
Berman	Dyson	Jones (NC)
Bevill	Early	Jontz
Bilbray	Eckart	Kanjorski
Boehlert	Edwards (CA)	Kaptur
Boggs	Engel	Kasich
Bonior	English	Kastenmeier
Borski	Erdreich	Kennedy
Bosco	Espy	Kennelly
Boucher	Evans	Kildee
Boxer	Fascell	Kleczka
Brennan	Fazio	Kostmayer
Brooks	Feighan	LaFalce
Browder	Foglietta	Lagomarsino
Brown (CA)	Ford (MI)	Lancaster
Brown (CO)	Frank	Lantos
Bruce	Frost	Laughlin
Bryant	Gaydos	Leath (TX)
Bustamante	Gejdenson	Lehman (CA)
Byron	Gephardt	Lehman (FL)
Campbell (CA)	Geren	Levin (MI)
Campbell (CO)	Gibbons	Levine (CA)
Cardin	Glickman	Lewis (GA)
Carper	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Chapman	Gordon	Lloyd
Clarke	Gray	Long
Clay	Green	Lowey (NY)
Clement	Guarini	Lukens, Donald
Coleman (TX)	Hall (OH)	Machtley
Collins	Hall (TX)	Manton
Condit	Hamilton	Markey
Conte	Harris	Martinez
Conyers	Hatcher	Matsui
Cooper	Hawkins	Mavroules
Costello	Hayes (IL)	Mazzoli
Cox	Hayes (LA)	McCloskey
Coyne		McCurdy

McDermott	Price	Solarz
McHugh	Pursell	Spratt
McMillen (MD)	Rahall	Staggers
McNulty	Rangel	Stallings
Mfume	Ray	Stark
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Stenholm
Miller (WA)	Rinaldo	Stokes
Mineta	Roe	Studds
Moakley	Rohrabacher	Swift
Mollohan	Rose	Synar
Montgomery	Rostenkowski	Tallon
Moody	Roukema	Tanner
Morella	Rowland (CT)	Tauzin
Morrison (CT)	Rowland (GA)	Taylor
Mrazek	Roybal	Thomas (GA)
Murtha	Russo	Torres
Nagle	Sabo	Torricelli
Natcher	Saiki	Towns
Neal (MA)	Sangmeister	Traffant
Neal (NC)	Sarpalius	Traxler
Nowak	Savage	Udall
Oberstar	Sawyer	Unsoeld
Obey	Scheuer	Valentine
Olin	Schneider	Vento
Ortiz	Schroeder	Visclosky
Owens (NY)	Schuetz	Volkmer
Owens (UT)	Schumer	Walgren
Pallone	Sharp	Walsh
Panetta	Sisisky	Washington
Parker	Skaggs	Watkins
Parris	Skelton	Waxman
Patterson	Slattery	Weiss
Payne (NJ)	Slaughter (NY)	Wheat
Payne (VA)	Smith (FL)	Whitten
Pease	Smith (IA)	Williams
Pelosi	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Penny	Smith (VT)	Wise
Perkins	Smith, Denny	Wolpe
Pickett	(OR)	Wyden
Pickle	Smith, Robert	Yates
Porter	(NH)	Yatron
Poshard	Snowe	

NOT VOTING—18

AuCoin	Ford (TN)	Nelson
Bilirakis	Kolbe	Oakar
Carr	Kolter	Sikorski
Donnelly	Lukens, Thomas	Vander Jagt
Flake	McDade	Vucanovich
Flippo	Murphy	Young (AK)

□ 1605

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bilirakis for, with Mr. AuCoin against.
Mr. McDade for, with Mr. Sikorski against.

Mr. HORTON and Mr. GOODLING changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H.R. 2712), to facilitate the adjustment or change of status of Chinese nationals in the United States by waiving the 2-year foreign residence requirement for "J" nonimmigrants.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of voting to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712, The Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989, and I am pleased to yield 30 minutes of the time to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish], for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2712 simply waives, for students from the People's Republic of China, the requirement that foreign exchange visitors must go home at least 2 years after they have completed their studies here. The House has overwhelmingly approved H.R. 2712 on three separate occasions, the last time, which was the conference report, by a recorded vote of 403 to 0. The Senate has approved the measure unanimously on three separate occasions. But the President's decision to veto the bill compels the House and Senate to vote on it once again, and that's what we'll be doing today.

We don't enjoy being at loggerheads with the administration over this bill. And this issue, really, is not whether the terms and conditions of H.R. 2712 are good or bad, because the fact is that the administration has agreed that they are good and suggests it will implement administratively all of those terms and conditions. So we are arguing about substance, we are arguing about process. And so this is our choice: Do we want a statute or, instead, an administrative decree?

Frankly, I am not convinced that the executive branch has the authority under existing statutes and regulations to provide the kind of blanket waiver called for in the bill. In any event, I submit that the rights and benefits embodied in H.R. 2712 are deserving of statutory protection. They are immigration rights, but they are also human rights, and should not be relegated to the back pages of the Code of Federal Regulations or field instructions issued by the INS.

Furthermore, in light of a particular case of which I am aware, I am not at all sure that the administration will implement in good faith its stated intentions. The son of a friend of mine in China has been admitted to a university in the United States and is supposed to reenroll there today. He has his Chinese passport and his exit visa, but has twice been denied an entrance visa by the United States State Department. When President Bush vetoed this bill, he stated that he wanted to see these exchanges continue because it is in the national interest of the United States. But in this instance, it is not China, but rather the United States Government who is prohibiting this student's departure to the United States. If our current administrative policy is that inconsistent and uncertain, I certainly do not want

to rely on any future administrative action to accomplish the purposes of H.R. 2712.

There are signs that the administration's efforts to normalize relations with the People's Republic of China are having some effect. The resumption of educational and cultural contacts with China, as well as that Government's release of a number of individuals who had been detained after last year's demonstrations show that relationships are improving. I do not believe that this bill will have any damaging effect on those efforts. Rather, it will show our Nation's resolve that long-term improvements in relations between the two countries must be grounded on a mutual respect for individual rights.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOS] who is the primary sponsor of H.R. 2712 for all the excellent hard work she has done and I urge my colleagues to vote once again for H.R. 2712 by voting "yes" on the question of overriding the President's veto of this important bill.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly discuss a matter of great constitutional significance which the President's actions on this bill have raised. The President, in his "memorandum of disapproval," stated that "the adjournment of the Congress has prevented my return of H.R. 2712 within the meaning of article I, section 7, clause 2 of the Constitution. Accordingly, my withholding of approval from the bill precludes its becoming law." The President cites the pocket veto case of 1929 in support of this proposition. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the President is wrong and he has seriously misread the Constitution. His message is an attempt to encroach upon the prerogatives of the Congress.

The Constitution is quite clear. It states that:

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such reconsideration two thirds of the House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a law. (Article I, section 7, clause 2).

A bill does not become law if the Congress, by its adjournment, prevents its return—the so-called pocket veto.

Mr. Speaker, the facts in this situation are quite clear. The President has vetoed the bill. He has done what the Constitution requires. He has returned the bill to the House with his objec-

tions. The memorandum of disapproval has been entered into the Journal. It is now the constitutional duty of the House to decide whether the bill shall become law, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The allegation by the President that he has pocket vetoed the bill is wrong both as a matter of fact, and improper as a matter of governmental policy. It is wrong as a matter of fact since the President returned the bill with his objections to the originating House. Prior to the recess, both Houses adopted House Concurrent Resolution 239, the adjournment resolution, which specifically authorized the Clerk of the House, and the Secretary of the Senate to receive messages from the President when their Houses were not in session for the stated purpose of preserving their "constitutional prerogative * * * to reconsider vetoed measures in light of the objections of the President." By virtue of House Concurrent Resolution 239, the Congress intentionally acted so as not to prevent the President from returning any bill to the Congress for its reconsideration. For purposes of the pocket veto clause of the Constitution, the Congress was here to receive any message the President wished to send. Accordingly, in my opinion, the bill was subjected to a normal, or return veto.

The President's attempt to invoke a pocket veto in this situation is wrong as a matter of governmental policy because it is an encroachment upon the prerogatives of the Congress to reconsider bills which have been disapproved by the President. We have a solemn duty to undertake such a reconsideration. The constitutional language which I have cited clearly contemplates that, as a check on executive authority, the Congress will have the right to reconsider bills, taking the President's objections into consideration. There is no viable governmental purpose served by this naked attempt to deprive the Congress of the opportunity for such review.

While some may argue that the length of time during which the Congress will be unable to reconsider a bill between sessions necessitates the President's taking the final action in the form of a pocket veto, I do not agree with this reasoning. Vetoed bills which are returned are subject to referral to committees and other postponements. There is never a time certainty of their consideration. There have been occasions when vetoed bills have laid over for many months before reconsideration by the House. As long as the originating House will be able to reconsider the bill at some time, the pocket veto is inappropriate. The pocket veto serves no valid purpose during a Congress.

Both President Ford and President Carter recognized this fact and agreed to use their return veto during both intrasession adjournments and intersession adjournments. They recognized that in modern times the Congress truly only prevents the return of a bill in the constitutional sense when it adjourns sine die at the end of the second session of a Congress. I believe that is the only time when the pocket veto's use is justified.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the matter before us, H.R. 2712 is properly here as a bill returned by the President with his disapproval. I hope that my colleagues will send a message to the President by overriding this veto both on the substance of this very important legislation, and on the serious constitutional issue of ensuring that the President respects the important responsibility of the Congress to reconsider legislation which he has disapproved.

□ 1610

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, recent reports give a sense of urgency to the issue we are discussing here today.

Over the weekend, we learned that China has imposed new restrictions on foreign journalists.

That suggests to me that things are getting worse, not better, and that the authorities do not want the U.S. Congress and others in the world to read about future acts of repression.

We have also recently learned that more than 800 Chinese have been sent to prison for so-called counterrevolutionary crimes.

That can mean nothing more than making a disparaging remark about the Chinese Communist Party or one of its leaders.

Many face prison terms of 10 years or more.

I am sure many of my colleagues watched brave young Chinese students talk openly about the past and future of China on a number of television talk shows.

One I remember was a young graduate student at Harvard. He discussed the Chinese leadership with a lot of insight, and a lot of courage as well.

This bill will show that young student, and 40,000 others like him, that America takes its commitment to freedom of speech very seriously.

The President says these students can be protected through an executive order.

While I trust the President, and an executive order may be enough to do the job, I know that these 40,000 stu-

dents would feel a lot more confident if their safety were guaranteed by law. So would I.

That is why I am going to vote to override the veto.

Yes, the United States has an agreement with China that obliges us to make sure their students return.

But in this case, America has a higher obligation. America also has laws and traditions which guarantee asylum to anyone with a well-founded fear of persecution.

Hundreds of Chinese students died in Tiananmen Square and hundreds of others are now in prison.

Thousands of students have been forced to sign confessions that can later be used against them.

I cannot believe we would ever deny asylum to people under such circumstances.

If we do not provide full legal protection to these students, we will be sending the wrong message to tyrants around the world.

There are surely men in the Kremlin and elsewhere who are drawing their own lessons from the events in Tiananmen Square.

If the Chinese leaders pay no price, either at home or abroad, others might find it a whole lot easier to succumb to the Tiananmen temptation.

Political leaders everywhere must know that the world community will not stand idly by while tyrants commit grave crimes against those they are supposed to serve and protect.

Make no mistake about it: this vote is a referendum on human rights that will be heard around the world. To tyrants, it will send a message that Americans will not countenance butchery.

To those who seek freedom, it will send a message that America will not abandon its principles.

Some may argue that not every culture subscribes to what they call Western concepts of freedom.

That may have been true in the past, but the sight of Miss Liberty being carried aloft by demonstrators in Beijing convinced me that these so-called Western concepts appeal to people all over the world.

The desire to be treated with kindness and dignity is a longing common to all men and women, both East and West.

I appreciate the difficult position President Bush finds himself in. America cannot always choose the heads of state it wishes to deal with.

It would be nice if the world's governments were led by Woodrow Wilsons and Dag Hammarskjolds, but that is not likely to happen anytime soon.

Yes, we should deal with the Chinese Government. However, let us do it not on their terms but on terms that accord with accepted norms of decent behavior.

China's old and tyrannical leadership is crumbling. A new generation is poised to rebuild China on a foundation of greater political and economic freedom.

One day I hope these 40,000 students will feel it is safe enough to return home to help rebuild their country.

Until that happens, the United States should do everything it can to protect them.

America should be remembered for providing a launching pad for China's leadership of the future—not for providing crutches for its tyrants of the past.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON], chairman of the subcommittee which brought this legislation out.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our Committee on the Judiciary for yielding me this time. I appreciate the opportunity to briefly urge my colleagues to vote in support of the motion in support of overriding the President's veto.

The President has made an unfortunate mistake, but we can correct it here on the floor of the House, and we can urge forward our Senate colleagues to do the same tomorrow.

This is a clear choice. Where do the people of America stand? We speak on their behalf when we say we stand on the side of democracy and freedom, the aspirations of the Chinese people as represented in their best and brightest who have come here to the United States to study. It is our duty to protect them from the harassment that they are receiving from the Chinese officials here in the United States, to protect them from the harassment that their families receive at home, to tell them clearly that, yes, the United States stands by their side, on their side, in support of their hope for the future of China. We will hear it said by some in this debate that this override has no practical significance. It certainly has a great symbolic significance. It tells us where America stands. It tells the Chinese where America stands. But it also tells the immigration authorities who makes the law with respect to immigration. The fact is that the President's administrative order does not comply with the existing statute, is outside of his legal authority.

It is the fact that he could withdraw the very benefits that he has given, and a court could order him to do so because they are outside of the statutory framework. Only through a statutory enactment can we guarantee that the intent of this Congress will be enforced. That is why this override not only sends a message to China, not only sends a message to the students,

but sends a message up Pennsylvania Avenue to the President that lawmaking requires that the constitutional process be obeyed. This veto and administrative action does not do that. The vote to override will do so. The law will be clear. It will be permanent. It will be protection, the very thing we want to give.

□ 1420

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary regarding the intent of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that several American universities maintain research facilities outside of the United States. Is it the understanding of the chairman that those students who have been involved in academic activities outside the United States and who as a result were out of the United States for purposes of pursuing their degrees on January 5, 1989, would be considered as having maintained their lawful status under the "brief, casual, and innocent departure provision" of H.R. 2712?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding of the meaning of that legislation.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman. I urge my colleagues to vote for the override.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to vote against this motion to override. There are so many symbolic statements that it makes that I am about convinced that I should vote to override. But I think in all fairness, the case has not been as adequately made as might have been made for the position of the President, and I wish that the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] had been granted so that Members could have heard a fuller explication of the position of the President.

I think it is important to understand the geostrategic significance of China. It is important that we maintain diplomatic leverage with that important member of the Security Council.

What about Hong Kong? At the end of this decade Hong Kong will revert to the People's Republic of China. Under what terms? Under what conditions? How free or unfree will those people be?

Would not some leverage by the United States be helpful for the cause of freedom which we are all dedicated to?

What about Pol Pot? What about Cambodia? The Chinese have supported the greatest butcher in recorded

history, Pol Pot. Can we not have some influence to wean them away from supporting the Khmer Rouge in a post-North Vietnamese Cambodia? Is that not important? Are human lives not at stake? Do we lose leverage by doing this gratuitous, albeit important, symbolic gesture?

What about North Korea, which is developing a nuclear facility? What about the Chinese influence on North Korea? What about our influence over China vis-a-vis North Korea? Is that important? Do we throw that out the window for a symbolic statement that makes us feel good? We will feel good, but we will not protect a single student, because they are already protected by the administration. These things are important.

Now, if we are sensitive to human rights offenses, how can you feel comfortable about the Middle East? But not a word will be said about that. This is an easy vote.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, in a way, this debate is both unfortunate and unnecessary. If the President, from the moment the bullets first began to fly in Tiananmen Square, had effectively expressed the outrage of the American people, if he had imposed sanctions at the outset rather than being forced to do so by the Congress, if he had not sent General Scowcroft and Mr. Eagleburger to Beijing at the very same time he was telling the American people we had suspended all high-level contacts with China, there would probably not have been any need for this legislation.

But the fact is that the President has consistently demonstrated that he is more sensitive to the concerns of the Chinese leadership than to the hopes and fears of the Chinese people.

So we need this legislation. We have to override the President's veto because on the Chinese issue, he simply no longer has the kind of credibility which would command confidence in his assurance that his directive on Chinese students would remain valid for the indefinite future.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to say that I am going to support the motion to override the President. I think that we have here a situation in which the President has had his heart in the right place. He has issued directives that have effectively to this point kept any Chinese students from being forcibly repatriated, if you will, to Communist China. In fact, H.R. 2712 is effectively a codification of the President's directives. They are very

much the same. That is a fact, and I think we must concede that the President has attempted to do through administrative directive what Members are doing statutorily.

Nonetheless, I think it is important that we do this statutorily. I think there could be a challenge in the courts against the President's directives. I think there is a good argument to the effect that they are taken in violation of statute or that they go against statute and could be challenged successfully in court.

Second, I think it is very important that we send this message. This is an important time of message sending to the Communist Chinese. I welcome them aboard and I think we as conservatives should welcome aboard our liberal friends who have found this new anticommunism in their vocabulary. I almost heard a few Members from the other side of the aisle speak of the evil empire.

This is an evil empire. It is the empire that killed 40 million people, executed 40 million people in China since 1950 by British estimate without a whimper from America's liberals.

Ten minutes on television in Tiananmen Square did for the conservative cause against communism what 20 to 30 years of op-ed pieces did not do.

Let us make sure our message is consistent. We are helping the President by codifying his directives. I would urge my fellow conservatives to vote to override the veto.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, last June the world witnessed an event that came to symbolize the struggle of people everywhere who stand up against injustice. That image was captured in the picture of a single Chinese protester, standing unarmed, bringing a column of Red army tanks to a halt. More than any other, that picture remains a symbol for a movement for democracy that stretched far beyond the confines of Tiananmen Square.

In June, President Bush referred to the lone student and said, "All I can say to him, wherever he might be, or to the people around the world is we must stand with him. And that's the way it is. And that the way it's going to be."

That is what makes his decision to veto this bill so perplexing. H.R. 2712 passed the House 403 to 0. The bill would offer protection to those Chinese students who otherwise would have to return to China once their visa expires. While the President argues that the situation can be handled through administrative directives, there is no law authorizing these directives and they can be easily re-

pealed or modified by the administration.

The students deserve more of an assurance. They deserve the guarantee of U.S. law that was passed unanimously by this House. And frankly, they deserve an explanation for the President's secret policy toward China.

Just a few weeks after the events in Tiananmen Square, the President sent two top aides to China in apparent contravention of his own announced ban on high-level exchanges. I am sure that the distinction between "contacts" or "exchanges" was lost on most of these students.

The secret mission did more to cloud what should be a strong, consistent, and clear policy of telling the leadership in Beijing that there is a price to pay for the brutality of the Tiananmen Square massacre. We should be delivering that message in public and in private, in Washington, and in Beijing.

Today, we can amplify that message and at the same time offer support and safety to those Chinese students in this country who need to know that we stand with them in their fight for democracy and human rights in China.

□ 1630

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, June 4 has come and gone, and Tiananmen Square will not be forgotten. The Chinese people have gone through an incredible cultural revolution in recent decades.

The fundamental family in China has changed. Today that family involves one husband and one wife and one child in virtually every circumstance. At Tiananmen Square the leaders of the Chinese Government had several choices: They could have separated those young people, forced them out of the square, they could have killed a lot of people, they could have done many things. They chose to kill a lot of people, and they were killing the single child of endless numbers of Chinese families, families that had given their all to give the best opportunity for their children. Those children were killed by autocratic action. Tiananmen Square will not be forgotten, and today I am voting to override the President's veto so that those families will understand that the people's house in this Government will remember as well.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. APPLEGATE].

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, the action that we take here today is not just to protect Chinese students from prosecution or persecution but, in the large picture, the Bush veto must be overridden by Congress to show the

rest of the world that this administration will not continue to cater to the Chinese butchers, nor sit still and watch the oppressive Chinese Government of China murder thousands of freedom-seeking Chinese and do nothing about it.

We may not change the Chinese Government, and it is not our right to do so, but we sure as hell can let them know by this action and subsequent actions that we will not sell out democracy nor its democratic principles.

Americans have fought too long, too many Americans have died over 200 years protecting these democratic principles.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a unanimous vote.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the House' support in overriding the President's pocket veto of H.R. 2712.

The President chose to veto the bill last November and, instead, used an executive order to give Chinese students here the same protection it would have offered. His motivation was good; he wants to protect the students and at the same time try to persuade the Chinese Government to continue our existing exchange program.

But changing the regulations is not enough. As Congresswoman PELOSI said yesterday, the executive order contains a conflict with our existing immigration law, and a court challenge could overturn it. That in itself is enough to justify the override.

But beyond that, I don't think it's enough to say that passing the bill might make the Chinese Government angry. We can't base our policies on what the Chinese Government thinks of them. Our relations with that government are not what they were before Tiananmen Square. They neither can nor should be.

There is no hope for political reform under Deng Xiaoping and Li Peng, and we should not fool ourselves by saying that deferring to their wishes will bring that reform. Chinese citizens who peacefully asked for democratic change are now jailed, exiled, or dead. Economic reforms stopped with the crushing of the student movement, and hard-liners recalled to government since then are reversing those that remain.

If we believe we can stop that trend, we are wrong. Our friendly gestures will not be met with internal change. We will fail and we will lose the high standing we now enjoy with the democratic leaders who will lead China in the future.

I listened to interviews with some of the student demonstrators during the democracy protests on Tiananmen Square. They shared our deepest convictions. They were readers of Jeffer-

son and Madison. They are China's future; the old Marxist-Leninists in the Politburo are China's past. If we stand with the students now, we will benefit from it in the future. For that reason alone, I ask the House to override this veto.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, some say there is a symbolic vote here, in a belittling way. Men and women have died for symbols through the ages.

It is a symbolic vote. It sends the symbol of freedom and dignity and human rights to people in Prague and Budapest and Warsaw and Bucharest and East Berlin, and it sends the symbol of freedom throughout China so that the Congress of the United States will be seen to be committed to this fundamental American value.

But we now need a second symbol, Mr. Speaker. The recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, his Holiness the Dalai Lama, is not being received by the White House. If the White House wants to send a symbol of commitment to peace and dignity and reconciliation and human rights, it should now, in the wake of this vote, extend an invitation to the Dalai Lama, the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, so that he can talk to our President.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the override of the President's veto and I commend the gentleman from California Ms. PELOSI for her outstanding efforts with regard to this issue. Many of us question the administration's policy toward China.

While I am reluctant to oppose our President, the human rights abuses in the People's Republic of China and in Tibet are so severe as to warrant critical, decisive action. Dissident students cannot be protected by executive order. They must have the guarantee that only a statute can provide.

On October 5, 1989, Chinese student leaders held a conference here in Washington at the invitation of the Congressional Human Rights Foundation. That same day the Nobel Prize committee announced that his Holiness the Dalai Lama was chosen to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. Accordingly, every Member of Congress who addressed the students here that day chose to begin their remarks by congratulating the Dalai Lama and expressing the hope that the demonstrations by the students and the Tibetans will continue to be nonviolent.

Ironically, it will stand as a subtle twist of history that 2 months later, on the same day when the Dalai Lama was awarded the Nobel Prize in Oslo, a high level U.S. delegation in Beijing

toasted the leaders who ordered the slaughter of innocent students in Tiananmen Square, and the monks and nuns in Tibet.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the executive branch must stop sending mixed signals. At a time when Communist dictatorships are disintegrating worldwide, now is not the time for our Government to prop-up the most tyrannical of them all.

Democracy and our national security interests won't somehow magically follow economic reforms. And economic investments by Western private sector interests will never truly flourish in an atmosphere of oppression. If we so badly want the market that China represents, if we want China to be a positive force in the global community, if we think we have reason to depend on her in military terms and geopolitical strategies, then we must support the students and monks and nuns who are attempting, through nonviolent means, to bring democracy to the PRC and to Tibet.

China is at ground zero. Some of her best and brightest have been killed, arrested, or are in hiding. Her future hope depends on the education that we and other Western nations give to the thousands of students that are being harbored in the West. That education will be tested in the manner in which our democracy, their temporary home, responds to the crisis in their country.

Our veto override will serve as a good first lesson.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the override of President Bush's unfortunate veto of legislation to protect Chinese students from being involuntarily returned to China, where they may face brutal and unjustified punishment.

At a time when the celebration of democratic reform is sweeping the planet, the President counsels us to overlook the gross and repeated violation of basic human rights by the Chinese Government.

The President argues also that congressional action is not needed because he has taken comparable action administratively. How can the President argue that congressional action will insult and anger the Chinese Government, and then take supposedly similar action on his own?

No government has the right to slaughter unarmed and defenseless people who are demonstrating for the right to participate in the political process. No government has the right to treat those who demand liberty as enemies of the State, to destroy careers and families, to menace a generation of students, or to raise terror to the level of officially sanctioned State policy.

That is tyranny. This Nation, which in rebellion against tyranny, has historically given shelter to those who sought refuge against such brutality and oppression.

The policies of the Chinese Government did not end with the slaughter in Tiananmen Square. Since June 4, in actions reminiscent of the "Let 1,000 Flowers Bloom" campaign, the Cultural Revolution and the Democracy Wall protests, the Beijing government has unleashed a virtual reign of terror on its own citizens, and especially on student protesters.

At least 40 leaders of the pro-democracy movement have been executed, and arrests run into the tens of thousands. From personal accounts of past repressions, we know what terrible fates await many of those consigned to prisons and reeducation camps. In addition, the Government has taken brutal action against free thought, closing hundreds of publishing houses, newspapers, and journals.

Over 30,000 Chinese students currently in the United States are holders of J-visas, which require the holder to return to China for 2 years prior to seeking a change in their immigration status. In general, this restriction makes good sense, because we do not want to allow every foreign student who benefits from a U.S. education to qualify immediately for residency. That would frustrate our own immigration policies, and discourage many nations from sending their best students to study here in the United States.

But this is not a general situation. By overwhelming, bipartisan votes, the House and Senate agree that many of the Chinese students who hold J-visas may well face repression, imprisonment, reeducation, and other unwarranted forms of brutal treatment if they are compelled to return to China at this time.

H.R. 2712 provides flexibility to those Chinese students who might otherwise face repression if they are forced to return home at this time. Hopefully, conditions will change in China to permit their return when the grace period has ended.

But it is clear that little has changed since the Tiananmen massacre. Within the past 2 weeks, the Chinese Government, in lifting martial law in Beijing, hailed the crushing of the students on June 4 as a great event. That does not sound repentant to me; that does not suggest that the Chinese leadership even understands why the world was horrified by its actions.

Perhaps our own President does not understand fully either. I am aware that the President feels strongly that this bill should not become law. The administration argues that passage of this law will anger the Chinese Government and damage our relations.

Mr. President, with all due respect, the slaughter of innocent students, the continuing executions, the massive imprisonments, and the assault against civil liberties and freedom of expression—these actions by the Chinese Government are what has damaged relations between our Governments. Our sympathies and friendships with the Chinese people are unmarred—and are, in fact, strengthened by their current struggle.

The entire Congress owes a debt of gratitude to our colleague, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI of San Francisco, who has played such a critical role in raising this issue and securing passage of this legislation. When it becomes law over the President's objections, credit will most appropriately belong to this tenacious and effective Member of the

House, and I want to salute her prematurely for her outstanding leadership.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA].

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the override of the President's veto, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 2712.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 2712, the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989, I urge my colleagues to support the override of the President's veto and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The administration's rush to accommodate the perpetrators of the Tiananmen Square massacre, its reliance upon covert diplomatic maneuvers, and its desire for business as usual with the Chinese Government offers little security to the brave Chinese students who have no choice but to seek refuge in our country. Only the statutory protection afforded by H.R. 2712 adequately safeguards Chinese students from the real possibility of persecution if they are forced to return to China.

Override of this veto also sends a strong message to the aging Communist autocrats in Beijing. The United States Congress and the American people support the nonviolent movement for reform and democracy in China and have not forgotten the bloody crackdown last June and the ongoing repression of dissidents. We refuse to participate in a conspiracy of denial and revision of history.

The choices before the Chinese Government are clear: Follow the evolutionary course charted by Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, or suffer the same fate as the Ceausescu regime in Romania. We all hope that China will follow the nonviolent path toward democratization, but until we see meaningful progress in that direction, Chinese nationals in our country deserve our protection.

Our choice today is just as simple: Do we stand with the Chinese students in support of human rights, nonviolent change, and democracy? Or do we join the Chinese Government in silencing the voices calling for peaceful reforms? A vote to override reaffirms our commitment to freedom and democracy.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the Chinese students in the United States, and all the brave Chinese people persecuted because of their opposition to tyranny, and to support the override of the President's veto.

□ 1440

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of the Emergency Chinese Immigration Act, I strongly opposed President Bush's veto of this important human rights legislation.

The President's action sends a chilling message to the brave students and citizens of China who risked their lives during prodemocracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square last June.

Congress should overwhelmingly override the President's veto and grant

a 4-year home-country waiver for students with J-visas, and adjust the immigration status of any Chinese student whose current visa has lapsed and who faces persecution in China.

Under the President's approach these human rights protections may not be extended to nearly 600 Chinese students attending college in Kansas, or to the nearly 40,000 Chinese students, currently in the United States, who have courageously supported the prodemocracy movement in China.

Many people living under oppressive governments have long looked to the United States as a symbol of democracy, freedom, and opportunity.

Today we have an opportunity to send a message to the world that America is committed to advancing human rights for all people.

We should override the President's veto.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, while it gives me no pleasure, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto of H.R. 2712, the Emergency Chinese Adjustment of Status Facilitation Act. Having cosponsored this legislation, presented testimony in its favor before the Judiciary Committee, spoken out for it twice here on the floor, and, of course, voted for it twice, and signed a Dear Colleague on behalf of overriding, I believe this special measure is necessary and urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the veto and make H.R. 2712 law.

We are all very aware of the tragic events that occurred in the People's Republic of China in 1989. Unlike the incredible changes that have happened in Eastern Europe, the peaceful Chinese movement for greater economic and political reform was brutally and violently crushed by the Communist authorities with tanks, bullets, and blood. Just 2 weeks ago I was in Czechoslovakia and witnessed the dramatic events unfolding there first hand. I met with President Havel—who just weeks prior had been a political prisoner. In contrast to Beijing, in Prague, students, their parents and grandparents used their people power to end the Communist monopoly and renew hope for a brighter, democratic future. Like the East Germans, Poles, Hungarians, Romanians, Bulgarians, and Yugoslavs, the Czechoslovakians are taking—to use a Chinese slogan—"The Great Leap Forward."

Sadly, China continues to fight the tide and look backwards. Instead of positive reforms and liberalization, repression and abuse continue. The human rights conditions in China have not improved and the Chinese Government has made no real effort toward making any improvements. Since the June 4 crackdown, there have been numerous reports of arbi-

trary arrests, executions, and continued repression. Among the many examples of human rights abuses, Asia Watch reports that at least 40 prodemocracy supporters have been executed and within the last 6 months, at least 800 students have been arrested. Clearly, the terror in China continues unrestrained.

The protections provided for by H.R. 2712 are desperately needed by the Chinese students still in the United States. Like their counterparts at home, many of them rallied for democracy and spoke out against the Communist Beijing government. Their actions certainly did not go unnoticed—especially by the Communists in China. If forced to return to China, these students would be marked and subject to arrest, torture, and even execution because they spoke their minds, expressed their true hopes for the future, and took advantage of President Bush's visa extension for their own safety. The freedoms of speech, assembly, and press that we take for granted here in the United States are viewed as crimes by the Communist Chinese and would be used against these students upon their return to China in its current political environment.

While President Bush has already provided most of the needed protections through Executive order, and I applaud him for doing so, H.R. 2712 would provide greater security by establishing these protections through law. For example, some of these protections would necessitate the changing of current statutes. An Executive order cannot do that. A new law, like H.R. 2712, can. In addition, I am concerned that the temporary safety provided for by the Executive order will not be enough as the Communist government continues its repressive policy with no signs of change. I also believe that enactment of this legislation will signal to the Chinese Government that the United States will continue to stand up for human rights, liberty, and freedom.

While I am concerned about setting a precedent by this legislation affecting our immigration laws, I believe the nature of events in China and the fact that J-1 visas are exclusive to Chinese students makes this a special, separate situation, unlike others.

I am standing by the pledge I made to Chinese and American students at the University of California-Santa Barbara, located in the heart of my district, to support H.R. 2712 and override the President's veto. I urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override. The broader question that we face today goes beyond

this motion. It is: How do we promote human rights abroad, and how do we promote human rights in particular in a Communist nation like mainland China?

For the last several years we have applied steady pressure, including clear public statements on behalf of human rights. That policy has been effective in Eastern Europe and other places. Now, the issue is in the case of China, should we change that policy? Should we send a muffled message rather than a loud and clear message? That is what this is about, because both the President and the Congress agree that we should not send the students back to face a possibility of persecution, arrest, and possible execution.

For that reason, I just say let Members continue the congressional and American tradition of loud and clear support for human rights. Let Members override the veto.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, no political party, no philosophical grouping, has a monopoly on indignation. The conservative wing of the Republicans, the liberal wing of the Democrats, the moderate center, all respectively are appalled at the indefensible oppression of democratic dissent by the current government in Beijing.

What is at issue today, however, is not a question of indignation but of judgment—how America can play a constructive role in moderating Chinese institutions and liberalizing Chinese policies. If the history of the past decade is a guide, almost every effort by the United States to isolate China has accentuated xenophobic nationalism on the mainland. On the other hand, almost every U.S. step toward constructive dialog has been met with a liberalized response.

In this context, Congress must respect the President's initiative to establish a new high-level dialog with top Chinese leaders. On the other hand, the administration and Chinese leadership must respect Congress' commitment to do everything possible to underscore and underpin support for student visitors to the United States of America. That, and that alone, is a narrow basis of this particular override consideration.

Therefore, with the deepest respect for the President, the strongest possible support for his broad initiative, I would urge that this veto be overridden. But I do so exclusively with the understanding that it is on a narrow basis, and that it under no circumstances, prejudices this Congress toward a view on sanctions or toward any other policy of a strategic dimen-

sion with regard to the People's Republic of China.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, imagine that today is not January 24, 1990, but instead January 24, 1785, and that we are not Members of the United States Congress but instead Members of the Continental Congress. Imagine further that an emissary of the French king has given Members the choice of support of the French Government by law or the support of the French Government by giving the support of one of his subcabinet ministries by directive. Which would you prefer? A French law, of course.

That is the issue today: What is best for the Chinese students in our country, a law of the land or a directive of the commissioner of immigration? A law, of course, is best.

Do not confuse procedure and process for policy. The best policy is for the United States of America to protect by law the Chinese students today in our country. The students could someday, possibly, be Jeffersons, Madisons, Monroes, and Washingtons, of their country.

Today, the House of Representatives cannot allow the Chinese people's struggle for democracy to go unnoticed. Silence in the face of government violence against the Chinese people is intolerable.

I represent Texas A&M University in College Station, TX. Texas A&M has over 300 Chinese students. These students prefer the choice on whether to stay in this country to be a legislative protective choice, not a directive by the Commission on Immigration. Reports surface every day concerning Chinese students in the United States being harassed and intimidated by Chinese Embassy officials. In some cases, the students have been warned to be aware of what they say and do or their future will be jeopardized. It is for this reason we must do all we can to protect the Chinese students. Chinese students are not victims of political oppression, they are the target of it.

The directive issued by the President is a positive document. Simply put, it is not, in my opinion, the best way to protect, or the strongest way to protect the support of the Chinese students. We must override the veto.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I plan to vote "yes" on the override today. However, I believe it would be most unfortunate and most unfair to characterize the President's veto as one of opposition to the interests of the Chinese students or as opposition to those Chinese escaping Beijing's one-child-per-couple policy,

with the heavy reliance on coercion and forced abortion.

The President has, after all, put the essential provisions of H.R. 2712 into effect by Executive order, and as a matter of fact, his language on coercion in population control programs exceeds that of H.R. 2712.

It seems to me the not so subtle issue before us today is one of turf, of Presidential prerogatives in the formulation of foreign policy, and it is also one of the geopolitical importance of the PRC. Such concerns, in my view, carry some weight but pale in light of the oppression being visited upon the people of China by its leaders. It is right and proper that H.R. 2712 become law. Prudence dictates that we codify the President's Executive order.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the override.

Mr. KILDEE. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has 12 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

□ 1650

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the issue before this body today is not whether to provide protection for Chinese students but rather how best to accomplish this objective. Both the Congress and the President are committed to extending safeguards to those Chinese nationals who may face danger on return to China.

The President's veto of H.R. 2712, the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act, is an expression of his belief that the safeguards Congress favors can be implemented by administrative action. The legality and ultimate effectiveness of such administrative directives, however, remain in doubt. The certainty of statutory remedies, in my view, is preferable to administrative relief clouded by possible legal challenges.

The effort to accomplish the objectives of H.R. 2712 by administrative action is problematic—as a brief analysis of two of the bill's provisions confirm.

Firstly, the bill waives—for thousands of Chinese nationals—the requirement of current law that exchange visitors (the J nonimmigrant category) return to their home country for 2 years. Although current law includes a waiver mechanism, a decision to grant waivers to large numbers of people—rather than on a case-by-case basis—may exceed the statutory authority.

Secondly, H.R. 2712 provides that Chinese nationals shall be considered—for purposes of adjustment of status or change of nonimmigrant classification—to have maintained lawful status during the period of deferral of their enforced departure

from the United States. The provision effectively supercedes requirements of current law relating to maintaining continuous lawful status as a prerequisite to eligibility for adjustment to permanent resident status or change from one nonimmigrant classification to another nonimmigrant classification. An administrative directive that seeks to accomplish the same objective by making a statutory requirement inapplicable to a class of Chinese nationals arguably is invalid.

An override of the veto is advantageous, in my view, for other substantial reasons. The potential for revocation of administrative directives creates uncertainty about the continued availability of relief—causing needless anxiety for many Chinese nationals. Congressional support for the veto, in addition, can be misconstrued or issued by opponents of democracy abroad, who may argue—however erroneously—that Congress is abandoning its support for the Chinese students.

Mr. Speaker, I share the President's desire to maintain student exchange programs with China. My hope is that China will recognize that these programs remain mutually beneficial.

I urge my colleagues to support the veto override.

Mr. Speaker, I have one remaining speaker who will wrap up the presentation of the minority, and, therefore, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a situation where most of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle are on one side of the issue—the other side—and I would have to say that no doubt most efforts to sustain a Presidential veto are uphill, if not outright vertical. Still, even if the President does not have the votes, he does have the better argument.

In fact, the President's administrative directive is broader and better than the bill in question. It is broader because it applies not just to Chinese students but to all Chinese nationals who are in this country and who fear persecution at home.

It is better because it will not result in the termination of cultural exchange programs which have been instrumental in the prodemocracy movement in China.

I would say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that it is easy to get caught up in a current of emotionalism that seems to swirl around this issue. It is not a question of whether Chinese students are protected. The President has already done that. The question is how, and the President's administrative directive is both better and broader. I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the President by voting against the override of his pocket veto of H.R. 2712, the Chinese Student Facilitation of Status Act of 1989.

The President's administrative directive provides broader protection than H.R. 2712 provides.

I, too, believe that those Chinese students here in the United States who face persecution at home must be protected by the United States until it is safe for them to return.

I demonstrated my beliefs by voting for H.R. 2712 in the previous session of Congress.

I was also a conferee for H.R. 2712 and assisted in working out the differences between the conferees so that H.R. 2712 could move forward to the President.

It is also because of my sincere desire to assist and protect the Chinese who live in the United States in fear of persecution that I will vote to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 2712.

Since the House vote on H.R. 2712, the administration has constructed broader protection for Chinese nationals in this country.

Not only does that protection more fully assist the Chinese, it allows the President to exercise his foreign policy authority and perhaps save now-threatened U.S.-Chinese cultural exchange programs.

The administrative directive provides broader protection in that it allows legal immigration status, employment authorization and notice of expiration of legal status to all Chinese nationals, not just students.

The directive also expands the protection given to those who fear coercive population control policies.

H.R. 2712 limits this protection only to Chinese nationals.

I want to emphasize that under no circumstances will eligible Chinese students be deported if the President's veto is sustained.

Recent efforts to override the President's veto attempt to make the case that the administrative directive provides uncertain and easily revocable relief.

This is a smoke screen for those who simply want to punish the President for his position on foreign policy with China.

Opponents to the President's administrative directive are trying to create an illusion that the directive is somehow ineffective, uncertain, and short-lived.

The facts do not support the illusion.

First, opponents to the administration claim that the President's administrative directive "conflicts with existing law."

This simply is not so.

At the President's direction, the Attorney General has exercised his authority to grant certain waivers under the immigration laws.

The Department of Justice and the Immigration and Naturalization Service have determined that the President has the authority to establish this directive and that it is in accordance with current immigration laws.

Second, those promoting the override vote claim that the President's administrative directive is "subject to court challenge."

The directive is not subject to a successful court challenge since there is no injured party.

The Chinese students suffer no injury since they will get the same relief, regardless of

whether it is granted through H.R. 2712 or the directive.

Precedent is clear that no one in this case would have standing to challenge a loss of immigration relief.

The third argument is that the directive "can be withdrawn anytime at discretion of the President."

The administration has stated that the administrative relief is "irrevocable."

Relief will not be prematurely withdrawn from the Chinese students.

Precedent supports this position—all prior administrative grants of extended voluntary departure have always continued for at least the initial time period prescribed by the administration.

The administrative directive is no more susceptible to revocation than legislation, which can be repealed at any time.

Since the President's administrative directive provides even broader protection than H.R. 2712, I can interpret the opposition to the veto in only one way: H.R. 2712 is being used to criticize the President's policy toward China.

This discussion of change in our immigration policy has developed into a vehicle to "bash Bush."

The Chinese students remain protected under the President's June 6 protection; waiting another few months so as to allow the administrative directive to work would not affect the protection already promised and given to the Chinese students.

If we want to discuss our differences in the matter of United States foreign policy with China, let us do so in an appropriate manner.

Using unnecessary immigration legislation as a tool to express discontent or disagreement in foreign policy affairs is inappropriate.

We, as Members of Congress, must not use this issue to promote our own foreign policy objectives.

By so doing, we needlessly gamble with the future of the Chinese students.

If we enact H.R. 2712, we will jeopardize the opportunities of future Chinese students.

The Chinese Government has informed our Ambassador to China that, if H.R. 2712 is enacted, the cultural exchange programs between the United States and China will be terminated.

Over 7,000 Chinese students have received visas to study in our country since the violence in Tiananmen Square last June.

I believe that it is because of these important cultural exchange programs that the pro-democracy movement was and is possible.

Chinese students who have studied in the United States, learned the value of democracy, and carried it back across the waters to China are the future of China.

Without the precious opportunities to exchange the ideas and principles of democracy, the pro-democracy movement may not survive.

In our efforts to be supportive of the Chinese people, it is easy to be carried along by the emotionalism of events of Tiananmen Square.

But we must put our emotions aside and look carefully at the facts of the situation.

I know that Members of this body want to send a message to Beijing that the American

people abhor the events in Tiananmen Square. We want to vent the anger we feel toward the Chinese Government for crushing a revolution which captivated all of us and gave us hope that the billion people of China would soon enjoy the freedoms that should have been theirs at birth.

We have sent that message. I had the opportunity to speak here in the Chamber as we voted 403-0 to pass this bill last November. Could we have sent a stronger message?

Now it is time to look after the best interests of Chinese nationals both here and in China. I realize that my colleagues here in this body that represents the American people feel compelled to use their votes to speak out against the Chinese Government, but I hope that if we do, and if we do vote to override the President's veto, that our colleagues in the Senate will allow this vote to serve as the symbolic expression of America's outrage, while using their vote to protect best interests of Chinese students, and the division of powers set forth in the document that established our freedom: the Constitution of the United States.

Join me in providing the best possible protection for the Chinese students and people by supporting the President. Vote to sustain his veto of H.R. 2712.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to make it clear that the United States is an advocate of human rights around the world. We are considering a measure that will afford protection to many Chinese exchange students who fear retribution for prodemocracy activities should they return home once their visas expire.

H.R. 2712 will protect those students by extending their visas, but it does more than that. It sends a message to the students, to the Chinese Government, and to the world that America will not trade the lives of students for comity with the Chinese Government.

By its unanimous vote, the House sent this statement loud and clear, but the President's veto has garbled the message. Today we must take the opportunity to make certain that the world understands our Nation stands firmly for liberty and human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], a member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues on this side have portrayed this issue somewhat correctly. It really is a narrow policy question, but it is a broad question of the separation of powers.

The President says that he is in favor of extending this period of amnesty for the Chinese students. I believe him. However, he wants to do it in a way that Congress says is inappropriate, and I think we are right. The reason I think we are right is not because I believe we are right from the institutional sense but because, unfortunately, the President has proven that his reasoning force and his capability to adhere to what he said previously on this issue is in question, and the documentation is simple.

In addition to the amnesty period which he said he would provide, he also invoked executive sanctions against China, cutting off military, joint cooperation, stopping the sale of certain items of significant military and technological capability to the Chinese, and invoking other sanctions. This pains me. It pains me greatly to tell my colleagues that the economic and military sanctions imposed on China by the Bush administration, even if they were adequate, have not been enforced.

The American people, I hope, are outraged to learn that the administration has continued to assist the Chinese Government in upgrading its military forces all during this period. They have agreed to continue the Peace Pearl Program, which is the upgrading of fighter jets, and have brought back Chinese technicians who were furloughed off back onto the job in the United States. They have continued and sent to the Chinese Government satellite tracking capability so that they can track missiles which the Chinese fire on test fires to develop the M-9 missile, which is what we asked them not to send the Saudis. That is the reason that this body must enforce its legislative capability. It is not that we do not think the President really wants to have that amnesty period.

The difference is that they are prone in the White House to saying one thing and, unfortunately, doing another. The program is important. The President has agreed that he believes in the Pelosi bill. They have passed it unanimously in the Senate by voice vote.

We all agree, and since it is our legislative prerogative to put in place items which cannot be changed except by us, not by executive action, this veto should be overridden. We should remain in control of this important policy question, and the President should understand it is for the benefit of the whole country, because ultimately, I say to the Members, the moral standards of this country are at stake. Our efficacy as a nation of democracy is at test here, and I believe we must pass this test by overriding this veto.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished author of

the bill, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], chairman of the committee, for yielding this time to me, and also for his leadership in helping to move this legislation forward. I also thank our colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his assistance, and I thank the ranking Republican member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish], for his assistance as well. I extend my appreciation to each and every one of our colleagues in the House who cosponsored this legislation and who spoke out in favor of this legislation.

I am very proud of it because it has brought so many of us together in a very bipartisan way. I think it is an appropriate way for us to begin this second session of the 101st Congress for us to rise in support of this legislation.

When I came to the House of Representatives, I was very proud to become a Member and a colleague of each and every one of you. I also thought each and every one of us was a colleague of everyone who served in this House before us, taking us all the way back to the origins of our Republic—those people, many of whom fought for our independence and helped give birth to our democracy. And in a spirit of bipartisanship that stems from our unity around the idea that we all stand for democratic principles, I wanted to add to our pictures of our Founding Fathers, George Washington on one side, and a friend of our Republic, the Marquis de Lafayette, the one man 200 years later in the square. Many of the speakers before me have referred to him, and I think so many Americans identified with him at the time, and still do.

On this painted picture, it says:

One man standing against madness kindles anew the sparks of freedom and elevates the spirit of man. How can we not stand with him?

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this legislation because I believe it gives the Congress the opportunity to stand with him.

The question before the House is, "Is the veto override necessary?" I believe it is necessary for two reasons. It is necessary to give statutory legal protection to the students, and it is necessary because it is an issue of safety for the students. The situation in China makes the override necessary.

Mr. Speaker, first we saw the massacre, and then we saw the masquerade. Many of my colleagues alluded to the events that have followed the massacre in Beijing: the repression, the denial, the continued repression, the increased repression following the

death of Deng Xiaoping's pal, Ceausescu, in Romania.

Now the Government of China, in addition to suppressing freedom of speech, because it became clear in June that, if someone speaks up for freedom in China, they can be killed, and many people were; now the Government in China, in opposing this override of this legislation, is trying to curb freedom of speech in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the President of the United States believes in human rights and that he does not want to send the students back, but I think the statutory legal protection is necessary because it guarantees the safety of the students. Not only that they do not have to go back, but that it guarantees that they can speak freely in the United States without any fear that their speaking out will be punished in China.

I know of a case of someone in my district who fled from China, from the Tiananmen Square massacre, had an interview with the press in the United States and is now wanted for rumor mongering in China. I ask my colleagues, "Can you imagine if everyone who had an interview with the press was wanted for rumor mongering?" In addition to that we know that the Chinese Government continues to take handwriting samples of students in universities in order to compare it to posters during the demonstration in May and June.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we disagree with the President on the method of reaching a bright future with China, one based on economic, cultural, and political ties because the President had to do what he had to do. He believed he had to veto the bill.

However, my colleagues, Congress must do what it must do. It must send what we have all referred to today as a very clear message to the butchers of Beijing that their behavior places them outside the circle of human behavior, and, if we are to continue this relationship, and we certainly do not want to isolate China, but to continue the relationship we must insist on their respect for human rights of the people in their country.

What if we do not send that message? What is the opposite message that turning down the override, if we sustain the President's veto, what is the message that will go forth from this body to the world?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that that message is that we in the Congress of the United States cheer Lech Walesa when he comes in for his fight in Poland, take great pride in all of the democratic sweeping of Europe that is going on now, but it will say, "The people of the United States, we support lovers of freedom throughout the world, and we support and encourage

the growth of democracy in all countries of the world and throughout the world. Not so fast, China. All those who wish to speak up for democracy, please step forward. Not so fast, China."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with the lone man and support the override of the President's veto.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I stand before this Chamber asking my colleagues to vote against the President on foreign policy issues. Nonetheless, today I have no choice but to urge Members to vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712, a bill to prevent the mandatory return of Chinese students to China once their J-1 visas expire.

This legislation is necessary because, without statutory protection, the fate of Chinese students is unclear. Clearly no one doubts President Bush's concern about protecting the 40,000 Chinese students currently residing in the United States. However, the reality is that the President only issued an administrative directive to the Immigration and Naturalization Service that can be withdrawn at any time. This action simply does not send a strong enough signal that the United States will not only protect the students, but will welcome those who choose to live in a country where freedom and democracy exist.

In addition, the Chinese Government must understand that if they really want these students back, they must improve the political environment—including basic human rights—in China before the students return. The Chinese authorities run the risk of losing the most brilliant young minds who are studying in the United States. We need to preserve the freedom of Chinese students to speak out on behalf of prodemocracy forces in China.

By offering a possibility that these students might become permanent residents and ultimately citizens in the United States, a clear message would be sent to Chinese authorities that unless the Government adopts meaningful reform, their students will not be returning home.

Although martial law has been lifted in Beijing, the reality is that repression continues in China. Since the June 4 massacre in Tiananmen Square, people around the world have raised their voices in support of the ideals of democracy and freedom for which the peaceful protestors died. There have been reports that more than 800 Chinese have been sentenced to prison for their involvement in the prodemocracy movement. As many of these students have received 10-year sentences for participating in "counter-revolutionary riots," the task of keeping the democracy movement alive rests on the shoulders of its supporters outside of China.

Mr. Speaker, we must provide a strong message to Chinese students in the United States that this is going to be a long-term commitment. As Americans, we cannot force Chinese students or exchange visitors to return to a country where personal liberty and safety would be endangered. Certainly, none of us are going to risk the possibilities of the consequences that could await these students if we changed our mind later on.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override President Bush's veto of H.R. 2712, the Chinese Students Immigration Relief Act.

By any accepted measure of international human rights, the human rights abuses and antidemocratic practices by Chinese authorities are serious: at least 40 prodemocracy activists have been executed, and over 6,000 people—according to official Chinese sources—have been arrested. In the last 6 months, at least 800 students have been arrested, including many leaders of the prodemocracy demonstrations. The Chinese students currently in the United States deserve adequate protection.

Instead of condemning the continuing crackdown on the prodemocracy forces, the administration looks the other way, resisting even the most minimal attempt to impact on or denounce the abuses. The President's administrative directive does not adequately protect the students, nor does it send the necessary signal to the Chinese Government that we will not tolerate continued oppression.

This winter has brought great changes: democratic movements have triumphed in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. The Romanian people have toppled a repressive dictatorship. How can we welcome the forces of freedom in Eastern Europe, yet turn our backs on the people struggling to bring democracy to Communist China?

We must send a clear signal to the Government in Beijing: We have not forgotten the violence in Tiananmen Square and we will continue to support the struggle for human rights and democracy in China, and around the world.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted if the House today rejects the President's veto of the bill to protect the Chinese students in this country. Like most Americans, I am deeply disturbed by the Bush China policy that has been revealed in recent weeks.

The picture that the whole world saw of our National Security Adviser, General Scowcroft, toasting the bloodstained Chinese leadership in Peking was an insult to the concept of international human rights, and frankly, I was ashamed. The vote today will help repair some of the damage that has been done, but I am at a loss to understand the reasoning of the Bush administration.

The Chinese leadership is old, desperate, and out of touch with its people and their aspirations. Making deals with these people makes no sense. They are a part of China's past. The Chinese students, who are studying here and in other Western countries together with their fellows in China, are China's future and we should be doing all we can to support and encourage them. The American people, in fact, understand these issues very well and that is the meaning of today's bipartisan vote. Let us hope it will help our President to understand.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2712 provides essential security for Chinese students studying in the U.S. in light of the massacre in Beijing and the ongoing crackdown. Despite the President's veto, it must be enacted.

Tragically, there is still much for them to fear. Arrests, persecutions, and even executions continue. No true form of dissent is al-

lowed, and those that spoke up in June are today punished. Listen to the words of the President of China's Supreme People's Court: "It is a mistake," he said, "to think that, because there is the law, justice can be executed without the guidance of the party's policies." Those same party policies currently guiding justice in China led to the violent June slaughter of peaceful demonstrators.

China is moving against the tide of history.

We are not just voting against the President's veto, we are also sending our message to the Chinese Government that we abhor their continued repression. I do not believe the administration has sent that message as strongly and as forcefully as it should have.

I am not in favor of cutting off all contacts with the People's Republic of China. Isolation of China is not in our interests, nor is it in the interests of the over 1 billion Chinese citizens. However, that does not mean that our hands are tied when it comes to human rights.

We constantly deal with governments which do not share all of our commitments to human rights—South Africa, El Salvador, the Soviet Union, and China are examples. Our country must stand as a beacon for repressed people everywhere. We must unequivocally state our opposition to government suppression of individual rights and fundamental freedoms whenever and wherever it occurs. China's freedom-seekers must have confidence that the United States will not put worn-out geopolitical considerations ahead of their aspirations for human rights personal dignity.

Government that abridge fundamental freedoms must face repercussions. In South Africa we imposed sanctions. In the Soviet Union we enacted Jackson-Vanik. And in El Salvador we restrict foreign assistance. Unfortunately, our response to the crackdown in Beijing has been unjustifiably mild.

The two secret Scowcroft-Eagleburger missions sent the message that our Government, at least with respect to China, was willing to look the other way. Toasting the butchers of Beijing was a slap in the face of all those who died in the streets of Beijing and all those who now must silently hope for a more democratic future.

If the Chinese Government wants substantial change in attitude on the part of Congress or the American people, I have a few suggestions: Lift martial law in Tibet; live up to the guarantees for a high degree of autonomy in Hong Kong; end arbitrary arrests; lift press restrictions; admit responsibility for the deaths this past June; and stop once-and-for-all using the cloak of "internal affairs" to avoid responsibility for blatant human rights violations.

Human rights are not internal matters. They are indivisible. The denial of fundamental freedoms and human rights anywhere is a threat to free men and women everywhere. By overriding this veto we stand solidly behind those who seek freedom in China and hopefully, if Beijing wants, the possibility for improved relations between our two countries.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, today, for all the world to witness, Congress will speak loudly where the President would only whisper. Today, Congress is standing up with strength and conviction to the forces committed to crushing the democratic movement in China.

Our vote to override the President's veto of the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act is not a vote to protect inspired partisan legislation. It is simply common sense.

A vote to override meets the absolute minimum standards of humanity and justice. It accomplishes what is obviously scrupulous. The very least we can do is affirm by law a principle which ought to go without saying: That the United States is a haven for those who face physical abuse and political oppression in their homeland.

Sadly, our President opposed that codification and vetoed our legislation. In doing so, he has sent a signal to the world that the implications of the brutality at Tiananmen Square are limited at best. I am not implying that the President is not concerned about human rights; what I am saying is that the President's actions leave those concerns.

The President points to areas of progress which the Government of China has made since the attack in Tiananmen Square. They've accepted Peace Corps volunteers. They've accredited a Voice of America correspondent. They've reopened Fulbright Exchanges. They've even lifted martial law.

I would suggest to the President and to my colleagues in Congress, however, that these are not examples of human rights advancements in China. These are insubstantial external offerings aimed at appeasing the world community which it alienated through the inhuman attack on its own people.

Can the carnage in Tiananmen Square be forgotten by an acceptance of Peace Corps volunteers? Can the more than 40 prodemocracy activists that have been executed be pitted against an accreditation of one Voice of America correspondent? Can the thousands of indiscriminate arrests be disregarded by reopening the Fulbright Exchange Program?

President Bush may be willing to accept those appeasement offering as genuine progress. I am not.

Simply put, the President has compromised the principles which he and almost all Americans hold dear in the interests of helping out an old friend, the Government of China. If this were a bill to protect Nicaraguan students against the Sandinista Government in their homeland, would we be debating a Presidential override? I doubt it.

Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to repair the damage done by the President's veto, to come to the aid of the students who need our protection, and to let the Government of China be clear as to our commitment to the students who perished in Tiananmen Square in their struggle to see democracy flourish in China.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto, and I commend my colleague from California, Ms. PELOSI, for persevering to see this important legislation through.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712, the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act.

It is essential that we enact this bill to give statutory protection to Chinese students in the United States. The administrative directive issued by the President simply does not give

adequate protection to the Chinese students living in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the massacres and executions in Tiananmen Square shocked and disgusted the world. Today, 7 months later, the violent oppression continues and the ramifications reach far beyond the borders of the Peoples' Republic.

The U.S. must deliver an unequivocal, united message to the government in Beijing: Your flagrant disregard for the human rights of peaceful protesters is reprehensible and will not be tolerated.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, the events in Beijing last June were shocking to this Congress, this country, and the free world. The use of lethal force in quelling student demonstrators seemed to be a vicious overreaction.

Our President's condemnation of the massacre and the imposition of carefully defined sanctions by Executive order were immediate, and firm. While steps have been taken—some say controversial steps—to keep official lines of communication open, that in no way diminishes earlier pledges of protection for Chinese students in the United States, reiterated publicly just this morning by the President in his news conference.

In our congressional zeal to impress upon the leaders in Beijing our abhorrence of their actions, let us consider doing so in such a way as to encourage a return to the stirrings of political and economic reform in that nation.

The United States is limited in influence on internal policy in China. Expectations or speculations that democratic reforms there can take place with the same dramatic rapidity as in Eastern Europe overlook the wide differences in tradition, history, and circumstances.

Ostracism of China by the United States, or punitive sanctions and harsh rhetoric, will simply give Beijing hardliners reason to isolate themselves and their policy from world opinion.

Much has happened in China since that horrible June day. Certain actions, such as the release—unharmful—of 573 demonstrators, martial law being lifted, and a Voice of America correspondent being allowed to enter their country, give promise of more tempered policy.

The substance of the legislative sanctions and immigration amendments under consideration in Congress can be achieved administratively. To escalate that message by congressional action would be counterproductive to U.S. best interests longrange.

The message of U.S. shock and outrage is a valid one. It can be delivered more effectively and more productively by administrative than by legislative means.

Mr. Speaker, these are among the reasons I have voted to recommit the question of overriding the veto of H.R. 2712 to committee for further evaluation, and will subsequently vote to support the President's position.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, Chinese students in the United States fear persecution in their homeland, and this fear is well-founded. Official Chinese sources confirm that to date over 6,000 people have been arrested for their involvement in the peaceful uprising in China. Unofficial estimates run as high as 30,000.

In the last 6 months, at least 800 students have been arrested, including many leaders of the spring demonstrations. Many of these students have received sentences of 10 years in jail for their "crimes"; these crimes include "divulging State secrets" or what we would term, "criticizing the Communist Party and calling for democratic reform"; and "disseminating counterrevolutionary propaganda" and "destroying State property," what we would term "putting up posters."

Although martial law has been lifted in Beijing, conditions there remain fundamentally unchanged. Chinese citizens involved in the prodemocracy movement are labeled counterrevolutionaries and live under the constant threat of arrest or execution.

In addition, Chinese authorities have ordered all Chinese students to attend mandatory reeducation classes. Students are forced to serve time in the military—the military that attacked them in Tiananmen Square—or work in the countryside before they are allowed to continue their studies. As a result, university enrollment has dropped dramatically.

Yes, martial law officially ended and students are no longer trampled by Chinese tanks. However, by suppressing their right to think and challenge the political system in which they live, students are suffocated instead.

President Bush promises that Chinese students residing in the United States who fear political persecution in China will not be deported. He calls this legislation redundant. In fact, to some degree, he's right: this legislation implements his stated policy.

However, he is also wrong. This legislation is needed. It is needed to solidify the President's policy into law. It is needed to relieve the anxiety of the Chinese students. And most of all, it is needed to send a strong message to the Chinese Government that their ruthless actions have not gone unnoticed, nor will they be tolerated.

If redundancy is the President's best argument, I say let's be redundant. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto. Thank you.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712, the Emergency Chinese Students Immigration Relief Act. While I believe the President has been a good manager of U.S. foreign policy, I believe his decision to veto H.R. 2712 was a mistake which Congress must correct.

Americans were shocked and outraged last June to see pictures from Tiananmen Square of tanks and armored personnel carriers callously running over peaceful student demonstrators and troops from the People's Army turning their weapons against those they were supposed to protect. Hundreds, if not thousands, of innocent people were killed. How, Americans asked themselves, could the Chinese leaders bring themselves to shoot their own citizens?

Americans justly demanded a response from their Government to these barbarous and heinous acts. The President imposed limited economic sanctions against China. Congress responded with a tougher, more comprehensive sanctions bill and passed the

Emergency Chinese Students Immigration Relief Act. Both the sanctions bill and the immigration bill enjoyed overwhelming bi-partisan support in Congress. H.R. 2712 was passed by the House unanimously.

Mixed with the pictures of an intransigent Chinese regime viciously putting down the promise of freedom and democracy were some hopeful images which suggested that, in time, the courage and determination of the Chinese students would bring them victory. The photos of a young man standing before a column of tanks and forcing them to stop was the most compelling of these hopeful images. The Chinese Government could not resist that type of courage and commitment forever, Americans told themselves.

American television screens were also flooded with hopeful images from halfway around the world, in Eastern Europe, where Communist power in Poland was collapsing. Solidarity was swept into office by the Polish people. The Poles made it clear that they had had enough of communism and wanted a legitimate government which respected the values of freedom and democracy in its place. Poland is now headed by its first non-Communist Prime Minister since the close of World War II.

The democratic revolution in Poland turned out to be the first in a series of peaceful, democratic revolutions that were to sweep through Eastern Europe the next 6 months. Only Romania's revolution was tainted by widespread violence. As the Berlin Wall came down, as Vaclav Havel assumed the Presidency of Czechoslovakia, and as Poland and Hungary made even greater strides towards democracy and market-oriented economies, it seemed that the tide of history has swung decisively in favor of freedom and democracy and that China would eventually succumb to its powerful current.

Americans had been told, and rightly believed, that events in Eastern Europe resulted in part from the determination of U.S. foreign policy to stand firm against the tyranny of communism. Faced with the immutable commitment of the United States and its Western European Allies to freedom and democracy, Eastern Europe was forced to come to grips with the inherent failures of communism and move towards pluralism and the free market. Americans expected the United States to pursue a similar policy towards China. The initial rhetoric from the White House following events in Tiananmen Square suggested that the United States would adopt a tough policy against the repression in China.

The President followed up his rhetorical denunciation of the Tiananmen Square massacre by sending two high-level delegations on secret missions to China. The images of the bloody assault against the students who had been peacefully demanding freedom and democracy were replaced by high level Bush administration figures smiling and toasting those who had ordered the execution of the demonstrators. Americans responded with moral indignation to the images of the administration embracing octogenarian leaders in Beijing. Why, they asked, had a policy so successfully applied to the Communist dictators of Communist Eastern Europe, been abandoned in

dealings with the Communist dictators in China?

The President followed his secret missions to China with a veto of H.R. 2712. He claimed that Chinese students in the United States could be protected by issuing a Presidential directive and that legislation was not necessary. Unfortunately, this is not true. The President's directive lacks a legal foundation because a number of its provisions are in direct conflict with existing immigration law. H.R. 2712 avoids this pitfall as well as others.

The President also cautioned Congress against reacting rashly to events in China. The United States needs to look at the bigger picture, he said, and cannot afford to isolate China. I want to state clearly, that the United States has not isolated China. China's leaders have isolated themselves. They gave the order to attack the demonstrators in Tiananmen Square; they are responsible for the deaths of hundreds of innocent people; they brought upon themselves the condemnation of the world. The big picture is a panorama hopefully displaying the rise of democracy and freedom around the globe. Only the dark clouds of China and the Bush administration's reaction to events there disturb the scene.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712 and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto of the Chinese immigration bill.

The passage of this legislation has a special significance for me and all the western New Yorkers following the case of Li Jin Mu. In Niagara County, NY, there is a young Chinese man in jail who is awaiting the outcome of his petition for asylum. In China, Li Jin Mu's wife was forced to have four abortions after their first child. But at the start of the last pregnancy, Li and his wife decided to leave China and seek the protection that they heard about on Voice of America.

Last March, Li and his pregnant wife left China and smuggled themselves over the United States border. The couple was caught and jailed. Li's wife was released from jail because of her pregnancy and soon after, she gave birth to a baby girl. Unfortunately the baby's father is still subject to deportation to China, where he is certain to meet persecution. Now in jail, Li seeks asylum and is likely to remain imprisoned for several months before his case is settled. He says this treatment is not what was depicted on Voice of America, but that jail, even death is better than what the family will face if returned to China.

Li's family is one of the few known cases of Chinese nationals seeking protection in the United States from China's one couple, one child law. President Bush has issued an administrative directive which would seem to protect both Chinese students and couples escaping forced abortion, but to date the President's action has been narrowly interpreted. We must make it clear that Chinese nationals like Li and his family are protected by our immigration law. A vote today to override the President's veto will do just that.

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I submit this statement to the RECORD to express my support for the override of the President's veto of

H.R. 2712, the Emergency Chinese Adjustment of Status Facilitation Act. The University of Minnesota has approximately 650 Chinese students and scholars, the single largest population of Chinese exchange students on any campus in the United States. They are a valuable asset to our educational system, enhancing our multicultural understanding and providing us with their talented research skills.

But this issue is not only of supreme importance to me because many of these students are in my State, but rather as an American and strong advocate of human rights. I was appalled to see the brutal crushing of the students peacefully rallying for democracy in Tiananmen Square in Beijing. Like our own ancestors these students cried out for their freedom even using quotes such as "Give me liberty or give me death." I am further horrified by this administration's kowtowing to this repressive government, which has not taken one singular consequential measure to abide by international human rights standards in the aftermath of the Tiananmen massacre.

Unfortunately, the conservative, more repressive wing of the Chinese leadership has taken over the Government and they have taken every possible step to ensure that this freedom movement has been squelched. We have all witnessed the arbitrary arrests, incarceration, and execution of many innocent individuals. Asia Watch has reported the slaying of 40 prodemocracy activists and the official Chinese estimate of 6,000 arrests falls far short of the unofficial number of 30,000. Many of these students have been sentenced to 10 years imprisonment for their counterrevolutionary activities. And these abuses are extending from within their own borders into our town. Chinese students who have participated in the prodemocracy movement in the United States are being threatened with retaliation by the Chinese diplomatic corp.

We must not abandon them in their time of need, but rather look for opportunities to help them by first, letting the Chinese Government know that these demonstrations, and their subsequent reactions, will have implications for future United States-Chinese relations; and second, protecting Chinese nationals here in the United States. President Bush has decided to do neither.

Chinese nationals in the United States have good cause to fear for their lives and, quite understandably, are afraid to return to China in its present state. The President's administrative directive fulfills the desires of the Chinese Government but does little to allay the fears of Chinese nationals. The administrative directive calls for waivers that are in direct contradiction with existing law and could be subject to court challenge. Additionally, since it makes no regulatory or statutory changes, it can be withdrawn at any time.

Modifying the Immigration and Nationality Act is the humane and compassionate response that expresses the beauty of our system of government and separates us from barbaric, totalitarian regimes. These students represent what the United States fought to obtain over 200 years ago. They represent the freedom to choose, the freedom to live their lives to the fullest, and the freedom to say "I don't agree." We must turn toward these stu-

dents, not away, and aid them by supporting the status adjustment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for this legislation and urge my colleagues in the House to override the President's veto.

The importance of this bill to the 32,000 Chinese students now in the United States cannot be overemphasized. Without the waiver of the 2-year home residence requirement provided by this bill, these students face an uncertain future when they return to China on completion of their studies.

I have spoken with and heard from many of these students in Minnesota since the brutal and tragic massacre of prodemocracy forces in Tiananmen Square. They have conveyed their personal fears and apprehensions about returning home to China to me. In addition to fear, they are also puzzled by the U.S. Government's actions since Tiananmen and consequently have raised many appropriate questions. How could the United States, the beacon of freedom and refuge for the oppressed in the world for over 50 years, be so overly concerned about offending the feelings of the Chinese leaders responsible for the slaughter of hundreds of innocent persons advocating democracy in a Communist country? Why aren't we standing side by side with the brave prodemocracy forces in China and their counterparts in the United States?

I shared their puzzlement about the administration's actions and have taken steps to support prodemocracy students rather than the Chinese regime led by antidemocracy authoritarians. I voted for a tougher set of sanctions than those put in place by President Bush and am an original cosponsor of H.R. 2712 and wrote personally to the President urging him not to veto this bill. While I do not doubt the President's intentions, I strongly disagree with his judgment on this issue. We need solid statutory protection for the Chinese students in the United States, not a weak administrative order which can be rescinded at the sole discretion of a President.

During the past several months, some phenomenal events have taken place in the world which have made the steadfast resistance of the Chinese Government to allow even a limited amount of democratic expression even more reprehensible. It is no wonder that the historic changes occurring in Eastern Europe are being kept secret to the Chinese people. As our spirits are lifted by the tearing down of the Berlin Wall and the withering away of the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, we must not forget the terrible tragedy of Tiananmen and the continuing repression of prodemocracy students in China.

Chinese students in the United States have very legitimate fears about returning to this climate of fear and repression in China. Today we have an opportunity to protect these students and send an important message to the Chinese Government. I urge my colleagues to support the veto override before the House today.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the veto override of the Emergency Chinese Student Relief Act. This bill will waive for 4 years, for Chinese students with J-visas, the current-law requirement that holders of J-visas must return to their

home country for at least 2 years before applying for an adjustment of their immigration status.

This bill is vitally important in order to provide legal protection to the 73,000 Chinese students who were in the United States during the Tiananmen Square upheaval. The President's directive to the Immigration and Naturalization Service is not adequate for a number of reasons. First of all, it is without legal validity because a number of its provisions are in direct conflict with the existing immigration law. In addition, the directive can be withdrawn or modified at any time. Last, it gives the wrong message to the regime in Beijing. At this time we should not be sending confusing signals; we need to express our disgust for Beijing's brutally repressive policies and our support for those who had the courage to stand up against them.

Most importantly, the President's directive does not provide the protection that the Chinese students across the United States need and desire. It does not alleviate the fear that the students and their families experience every day. Many of these students in the United States who were involved in demonstrations here are afraid with good reason to return to China. We must ensure their safety. As long as they do not have permanent legislative protection they will live in fear and their families will be subjected to threats and harassment.

Mr. Speaker, today in a unified voice we must override the veto of the Emergency Chinese Students Immigration Relief Act. We will be accomplishing two very important functions. We will be demonstrating our support for the Chinese students both here and in China, as well as sending the proper signals to the Chinese Government that we will not tolerate its violently repressive actions.

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, today we consider whether to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712, legislation which protects Chinese nationals currently studying in the United States.

I have been a strong supporter of this bill, simply because I feel that forcing anyone who faces certain danger in a foreign country to return to that country would disgrace a nation which consistently prides itself on being a haven for those in need.

The President himself agrees that we cannot send these students back. However, his alternative to this legislation is unacceptable. President Bush seeks to protect these students through an administrative directive. Such action is clearly without a satisfactory guarantee of protection. As there could be a change in the White House before there is a change in Beijing's attitude toward the Chinese students who seek democracy.

The President's plan fails to send a clear enough message to either the Chinese students in this country or to Beijing. We cannot adopt a policy that can be altered at whim, one which, in fact, hovers tentatively between what the administrations of the two nations would like and what the students need. We must instead demonstrate an honest commitment to standing our legacy of freedom for all people.

The only solution is to pass this legislation today, to reinforce our commitment to free-

dom with law. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this veto override and in support of human rights.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of Chinese have been convicted and sentenced to prison terms in recent months for counterrevolutionary crimes based on their involvement in the recent student led democracy movement. In addition to those accused of counterrevolutionary crimes, an undetermined number of Chinese citizens remain in detention without formal charges. Press reports have stated that as of last July close to 10,000 people had been detained or arrested. Arrests of prodemocracy activists continue, unannounced and unreported in the official press.

Some 32,000 Chinese students are currently in the United States under the Exchange Visitor Program and many of these students, like their counterparts in China, spoke out on behalf of democracy and against their brutal and repressive government. They courageously petitioned, marched, and appeared in the mass media. The Chinese Government knows who these prodemocracy activists are.

The need for a law to ensure sufficient protection for these Chinese students is overwhelmingly clear. Although the Congress has already approved such a law, the President has rejected this legislation and issued a much weaker directive as a substitute. This directive simply does not ensure the Chinese students adequate protection.

The administration's directive not only conflicts with existing law and is subject to court challenge but it also permits INS regional offices to interpret its measures in a restrictive and arbitrary manner. In addition, the directive makes no regulatory or statutory change and can be withdrawn anytime at the unreviewed discretion of the President and the U.S. Attorney General. Furthermore, the program would require students to relinquish permanently their current lawful status and thereby abandon their ability to adjust to some other legal status in the future.

It is clear that our country must change its laws to adequately protect these endangered students. We do not want to repeat, in a lesser form, the egregious mistakes made when the United States closed its doors to victims of the Holocaust during World War II. Instead of welcoming Jews seeking refuge in this country, the U.S. Government resisted efforts to ease rigid immigration laws and increase the number of Jewish refugees permitted to enter.

A bill that would have allowed 20,000 German Jewish children to enter the United States outside the quota was defeated in 1941. Other bills and appeals to the administration to permit refugees to enter by mortgaging future quotas and to open Alaska to them met the same fate. The State Department imposed even more complicated and time-consuming procedures on applications for visas. In the mid-1940's, when precious unused visas would have saved lives, the official in charge recommended putting "every obstacle in the way" and suggested various administrative devices that would "postpone and postpone and postpone the granting of visas."

Fortunately, some refugees were granted admission between 1934 and 1941. Among

these were a brilliant army of refugee scientists, writers, artists, and scholars including Albert Einstein, Ernst Simmel, Erich Fromm, Erik Erikson, and Herbert Marcuse.

Although we cannot correct the egregious errors that the United States has made in past immigration policies, we can prevent future suffering and death. I urge my colleagues to show that we have learned the tragic lessons of history and to act before thousands more fall victim to the treacherous hand of oppression. I urge my colleagues to vote to override President Bush's veto of H.R. 2712 and provide the endangered Chinese students with guaranteed protection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the People's Republic of China nationals who have come to study and work in our country should not live in fear that we shall one day turn them over to a government that seems to know little mercy and to leaders who perceive democracy to be a threat rather than a promise. The best way we can provide them with that security is to enact H.R. 2712. Thus, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote to override the President's misguided veto.

The administration argues that its directive on this issue is sufficient to ensure the same protections as those contained in H.R. 2712, and therefore that congressional action on the issue is unnecessary. The fact is, however, that the administration's measures to grant immigration relief to People's Republic of China nationals are subject to serious legal challenge. They are, on numerous accounts, beyond authority in current statute and concomitant regulation. And, perhaps most importantly, the administration's directive can be withdrawn at any time. What kind of security are we providing to both the People's Republic of China nationals involved and their future employers with only potentially temporary assurances?

Our administration has to be much tougher than it has been in demanding substantive reform within the People's Republic of China leadership. Congress has been unwavering in demanding that the administration hold the People's Republic of China Government accountable for the horrifying massacre of its citizens last June and the subsequent repression of basic human rights. Today we have a chance to let the President know just how committed we really are to staying that course. Let us stand firm and vote "yes" to override his veto.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support today's effort to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712.

Today's veto override vote is a reaffirmation of our commitment to democracy and the Chinese citizens who share our commitment and envision it for their own country. Although the President claims that this legislation is unnecessary, it represents the only realistic means to ensure the safety of the Chinese citizens residing in the United States as exchange visitors.

The administration directive to the Immigration and Naturalization Service as a replacement for the legislation is wholly inadequate. First, it is of questionable legal validity and conflicts with Congress' power to statutorily set immigration policy. Overriding the veto will insure that the Chinese citizens in the United

States are completely and unquestionably protected under the law.

A second and equally important concern is that the directive can be withdrawn or modified at any time, thereby leaving the fate of the Chinese visitors to the unreviewed discretion of the President and the Attorney General. These individuals need a commitment, a guarantee that they can exercise the freedom to speak out in the United States without fear of reprisal. No amount of verbal assurances will substitute for legislation.

At a time when the world increasingly looks toward democracy, we cannot afford to diminish our support for democracy. And just as China has shown no signs of easing its crackdown on reformers, we should be equally committed to our concern for the safety of the Chinese nationals in the United States and our support for human rights. Let's maintain the unanimous support for this legislation and override the President's veto.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly urge my colleagues to stand up for basic human rights of Chinese students in the United States and vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712.

In order for there to be true changes in immigration policies of Chinese nationals, Congress must establish statutory guidelines which will be applied to immigration boards and judges. As my colleagues know, guidelines have been issued twice before by the administration, and the immigration boards and judges stated the interpretation of the guidelines did not apply to them.

The INS still seeks deportation orders against those students seeking asylum stating that, as a matter of law, their defiance of Government orders does not constitute "political dissent." Well then, ladies and gentlemen of the House, what we need is legislation that does protect these students.

The President's directive has good intentions and is well meaning. However, how can we be sure the immigration boards and judges will adhere to the President's directive. Well, we can't be sure, that is why this legislation is so badly needed.

As the repression in China continues and becomes more severe, the Chinese students here at home truly fear for their lives. Until statutory protection is granted, the fate of these Chinese nationals remains uncertain. Therefore, I urge my colleagues again to stand up for basic human rights and join with me and vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, this Congress must not allow the Bush administration to ignore the plight of 42,000 Chinese students stranded here, whose rights are now in very real jeopardy by anti-democracy violence and suppression in their homeland.

I am unwilling to stand aside and permit the undoing of the human rights to which this Nation is bound at home and abroad.

This Nation once forced thousands of people who had escaped from persecution in Hitler's Germany to return to a Holocaust. We have learned much from that lesson, and I do not believe we will repeat it today.

The administration's order to protect Chinese students in America is much too little

and far too late. It is a weak and faulty alternative to Representative PELOSI's bill.

These students have no one else to turn to now in their time of trouble. I urge my colleagues to override the veto and send a message to Chinese Premier Li Peng and the Bush administration.

America should remain a sanctuary for those whose human rights are threatened elsewhere.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, since the Tiananmen Square massacre, 7 months ago, thousands of dissents have been arrested and at least 40 persons executed in further repression of anti-government sentiments. Communism is on the decline the world over, yet the Chinese Government has persisted to reinforce its position by denying basic human rights and the democratic process to its citizens. Worst of all, the President of the United States has certified China's intransigence to change through two actions: His reestablishment of full diplomatic relations and veto of H.R. 2712. Both actions were performed with complete disregard for the will of the American people.

International organizations have accurately reported human rights violations doled out by the Chinese regime. As a member of the congressional human rights caucus, I can attest to the credibility of these reports. Because Chinese law is so loosely written and defined, actions as hanging posters that call for political reform or criticize the Communist Party in any way may result in imprisonment or execution. Consequently, students who merely expressed their ideological beliefs have reportedly received 10-year sentences for allegedly divulging state secrets, destroying state property or disseminating counterrevolutionary propaganda.

In response to America's outrage, Congress unanimously passed H.R. 2712. The bill is designed to protect Chinese students currently residing in the United States who may have sympathized with the pro-democracy movement. In the House the vote was 403 to 0, in the Senate, 100 to 0.

When justifying his veto of H.R. 2712, President Bush claimed that enactment of the bill would taint the future of cultural, political and economic exchange between the U.S. and mainland China, and erode the Executive's role in foreign policymaking. Well, I disagree with both assumptions.

First, what the President fails to understand is that the global failure of communism mandates that we not placate China. Economically and politically they need us more than we need them. Second, is it worth sacrificing the lives of thousands of young Chinese men and women who have come to believe in democracy, simply to make a point about which branch of government is the preeminent foreign policy enforcer? I think not.

I am not willing to gamble away the lives of those young men and women through mere speculation. I am not willing to return those students to a repressive regime that will undoubtedly try many of them for baseless crimes against the state. But I am willing to protect those persons by voting yes on H.R. 2712, and I urge my colleagues to join me. I want to send a message to the President and

the Chinese Government, that America is a nation that respects human rights, a nation where an individual's rights come first, not executive privilege. Thank you.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I think that we all know the facts of this case. We have 70,000 Chinese students in the United States on J visas who, under current law, could be forced to return to possible imprisonment or even execution.

This bill would allow the students, who believe returning to China may threaten their lives, to stay here legally and without fear. It would also give them the security to continue their public support for the democracy movement in their homeland.

This country stands for freedom and democracy throughout the world, for all people. Let's not send these innocent students back to potential death or imprisonment.

Let's not leave them with the constant anxiety that their status depends on an administration that is infatuated with the idea of a relationship with China—no matter what the consequences.

Vote "Yes" for the override.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto on H.R. 2712, the Emergency Chinese Students Immigration Relief.

First I want to commend the work of Congresswoman PELOSI in putting together this excellent legislation. I also want to express my appreciation for the leadership's decision to make this bill a top priority.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the legislation before us today that will extend the visas of Chinese students here in the United States. I hope that both the House and Senate will vote to override President Bush's veto of this bill by a strong margin.

This legislation will accomplish two things. First, it will eliminate the 2-year foreign residence requirement for these students. Second, it will modify the Extended Deferred Departure program to allow the students who qualify to apply for permanent resident status. I feel that these measures are of utmost importance to Chinese students who are here in the United States and fearful of returning to China today.

These students, regardless of their personal views, come under suspicion by the Chinese Government simply because they have taken the opportunity to study at an American institution. We must recognize that reality and address it.

This veto override is important for two reasons.

First, it provides statutory guarantees—over and above the administrative steps that have been taken—to the Chinese students who need this protection and certainty.

Second, it sends a very clear signal to the Chinese Government that the people of the United States have not forgotten the events of Tiananmen Square; they have not forgotten the democratic aspirations of the Chinese people; and they are not willing to act as if it were "business as usual" in China.

I salute the Chinese students here and in China that have had the courage to speak out

again and again. I salute all the people of China who have dared to demand freedom. In passing this legislation today, we send a clear signal that we are on their side.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, some have suggested that instead of a veto override for H.R. 2712, Congress should put the override aside, by referring it or otherwise, and protect Chinese nationals by enacting a new bill. Their argument goes that if any congressional action were needed, the dispute with the President over his asserted pocket veto threatened by the Justice Department could be avoided by Congress just putting the veto aside. Passing another bill, we are told, would be a supposedly simple step, given the tremendous bipartisan-partisan support for protecting Chinese nationals and an entire session of the Congress before us.

This argument is deceptive and unpersuasive. Any diversion to attempting a new bill would mean further delays and uncertainties in protecting the concerned Chinese students. Moreover, starting over with a new bill would create real risks that this immigration protection would get wrapped up in the entire question of proposals for economic sanctions. This risk is doubly present when any new bill of ours reaches the other body, where such a proposal would be subject to all kinds of non-germane amendments, jurisdictional disputes, filibusters, second conferences, and other complications.

By resolving this veto override, we are recognizing that the President's veto, under the Constitution, is meant to give Congress a clear choice—should the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act, exactly as both Houses already voted for it, be enacted despite the President's objections? Let us answer that question with a clear "yes."

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the Emergency Chinese Immigration Relief Act of 1989. I am voting to override the President's veto on the status of Chinese student visas. The reason for my vote is simple. The Chinese students in both this country and in China have demonstrated great bravery and commitment to democratic principles by standing up to the dictatorial Communist regime in China. They are defenders of freedom. We cannot abandon these brave men and women in their hour of need. If they returned home now, they would face immediate arrest and possible execution. America was founded on the principles of liberty and democracy for all mankind, and we must help those who defend these sacred principles. My vote is a vote to confirm all that we stand for, and I will continue to fight against oppression wherever it exists in the world.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 25, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—390

Ackerman	Dingell	Inhofe
Akaka	Dixon	Jacobs
Alexander	Dorgan (ND)	James
Anderson	Dornan (CA)	Jenkins
Andrews	Douglas	Johnson (CT)
Annunzio	Downey	Johnson (SD)
Anthony	Dreier	Johnston
Applegate	Duncan	Jones (GA)
Archer	Durbin	Jones (NC)
Armey	Dwyer	Jontz
Aspin	Dymally	Kanjorski
Atkins	Dyson	Kaptur
Ballenger	Early	Kasich
Barnard	Eckart	Kastenmeier
Bartlett	Edwards (CA)	Kennedy
Barton	Edwards (OK)	Kennelly
Bates	Emerson	Kildee
Beilenson	Engel	Kleczka
Bennett	English	Kostmayer
Bentley	Erdreich	Kyl
Bereuter	Espy	LaFalce
Berman	Evans	Lagomarsino
Bevill	Fascell	Lancaster
Bilbray	Fawell	Lantos
Bliley	Fazio	Laughlin
Boehlert	Feighan	Leach (IA)
Boggs	Felds	Leath (TX)
Bonior	Fish	Lehman (CA)
Borski	Foglietta	Lehman (FL)
Bosco	Ford (MI)	Levin (MI)
Boucher	Ford (TN)	Levine (CA)
Boxer	Frank	Lewis (CA)
Brennan	Frenzel	Lewis (FL)
Brooks	Frost	Lewis (GA)
Broomfield	Galleghy	Lightfoot
Browder	Gallo	Lipinski
Brown (CA)	Gaydos	Livingston
Brown (CO)	Gejdenson	Lloyd
Bruce	Gephardt	Long
Bryant	Geren	Lowery (CA)
Buechner	Gibbons	Lowey (NY)
Bunning	Gilman	Lukens, Thomas
Burton	Gingrich	Lukens, Donald
Bustamante	Glickman	Machtley
Byron	Gonzalez	Manton
Callahan	Goodling	Markey
Campbell (CA)	Gordon	Marlenee
Campbell (CO)	Gradison	Martin (IL)
Cardin	Grandy	Martin (NY)
Carper	Grant	Martinez
Chandler	Gray	Matsui
Chapman	Green	Mavroules
Clarke	Guarini	Mazzoli
Clay	Gunderson	McCandless
Clement	Hall (OH)	McCloskey
Clinger	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Coble	Hamilton	McCurdy
Coleman (MO)	Hancock	McDermott
Coleman (TX)	Harris	McEwen
Collins	Hatcher	McGrath
Condit	Hawkins	McHugh
Conte	Hayes (IL)	McMillan (NC)
Conyers	Hayes (LA)	McMillen (MD)
Cooper	Hefley	McNulty
Costello	Hefner	Meyers
Courter	Henry	Mfume
Cox	Herger	Miller (CA)
Coyne	Hertel	Miller (OH)
Craig	Hill	Miller (NY)
Crane	Hoagland	Mineta
Crockett	Hochbrueckner	Moakley
Dannemeyer	Hopkins	Mollohan
Darden	Horton	Montgomery
Davis	Houghton	Moody
de la Garza	Hoyer	Moorhead
DeFazio	Hubbard	Morella
Dellums	Huckaby	Morrison (CT)
Derrick	Hughes	Morrison (WA)
DeWine	Hunter	Mrazek
Dickinson	Hutto	Murtha
Dicks	Hyde	Myers

Nagle	Roth	Stallings
Natcher	Roukema	Stangeland
Neal (MA)	Rowland (CT)	Stark
Neal (NC)	Rowland (GA)	Stearns
Nielson	Roybal	Stenholm
Nowak	Russo	Stokes
Oberstar	Sabo	Studds
Obey	Saiki	Swift
Olin	Sangmeister	Synar
Ortiz	Sarpalius	Tallion
Owens (NY)	Savage	Tanner
Owens (UT)	Sawyer	Tauke
Oxley	Saxton	Tauzin
Packard	Schaefer	Taylor
Pallone	Scheuer	Thomas (CA)
Panetta	Schiff	Thomas (GA)
Parker	Schneider	Thomas (WY)
Parris	Schroeder	Torres
Pashayan	Schuetz	Torricelli
Patterson	Schulze	Towns
Paxon	Schumer	Trafficant
Payne (NJ)	Sharp	Traxler
Payne (VA)	Shaw	Udall
Pease	Shays	Unsoeld
Pelosi	Shumway	Upton
Penny	Shuster	Valentine
Perkins	Sisisky	Vento
Pickett	Skaggs	Visclosky
Pickle	Skeen	Volkmer
Porter	Skelton	Vucanovich
Poshard	Slattery	Walgren
Price	Slaughter (NY)	Walker
Pursell	Slaughter (VA)	Walsh
Rahall	Smith (FL)	Washington
Rangel	Smith (IA)	Watkins
Ravenel	Smith (NE)	Waxman
Ray	Smith (NJ)	Weber
Regula	Smith (VT)	Weiss
Rhodes	Smith, Denny	Weldon
Richardson	(OR)	Wheat
Ridge	Smith, Robert	Whittaker
Rinaldo	(NH)	Whitten
Ritter	Smith, Robert	Williams
Roberts	(OR)	Wise
Roe	Snowe	Wolf
Rogers	Solarz	Wolpe
Rohrabacher	Solomon	Wyden
Ros-Lehtinen	Spence	Wyllie
Rose	Spratt	Yates
Rostenkowski	Staggers	Yatron

NAYS—25

Baker	Hansen	Quillen
Bateman	Hastert	Robinson
Combust	Holloway	Sensenbrenner
Coughlin	Ireland	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Lent	Stump
Gekas	Madigan	Sundquist
Gillmor	McCrery	Young (FL)
Goss	Michel	
Hammerschmidt	Petri	

NOT VOTING—16

AuCoin	Kolbe	Sikorski
Bilirakis	Kolter	Vander Jagt
Carr	McDade	Wilson
Donnelly	Murphy	Young (AK)
Flake	Nelson	
Flippo	Oakar	

□ 1724

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Kolbe and Mr. Bilirakis for, with Mr. McDade against.

Mr. HAWKINS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2712, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present on January 24, 1990, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 4; "nay" on rollcall 3.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3456

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3456.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2364, AMTRAK REAUTHORIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1989

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2364) to amend the Rail Passenger Service Act to authorize appropriations for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce: Messrs. DINGELL, THOMAS A. LUKEN, ECKART, SLATTERY, BOUCHER, LENT, WHITTAKER, TAUKE (except for section 4 of the House bill and section 4 of the Senate amendment), and BLILEY (solely for section 4 of the House bill and section 4 of the Senate amendment).

Additional conferees:

From the Committee on the Judiciary (solely for section 4 of the House bill and of the Senate amendment): Messrs. BROOKS, MAZZOLI, EDWARDS of California, FISH, and MOORHEAD.

The Chair will reserve authority to appoint additional conferees.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority whip the legislative program.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House meets at 11, but there is no legislative business. Friday the House will not be in session.

On Monday, the House meets at noon, but there is no legislative business. On Tuesday the House will meet at noon and there will be suspensions, and on Wednesday the House will meet at noon to consider the National Voters' Registration Act of 1989, and the House will recess until 8:30 p.m. on Wednesday and will reconvene at 9 p.m. to receive the President of the United States in a joint meeting for the State of the Union Address. On Thursday, February 1, the House meets at 11 a.m., and there will be no legislative business. Then on Friday, February 2, the House will not be in session.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me, if I might, ask of my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania: The gentleman mentioned suspensions on Tuesday, January 30. We are currently listing S. 1521, relating to the police force of the National Zoological Park. Does the gentleman expect any other suspensions, and would he happen to know what they are?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will yield further, not at this point. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the minority whip, we do not expect any, but certainly there will be proper notification of the minority and consultation before any addition.

Mr. GINGRICH. I also wanted to ask: There are two actions with relation to Panama. One is a resolution which I understand was initially drafted and then pulled this week commending our troops for their effort in Panama and commending the Panamanian people and possibly commending the President for his decision there. The second was something we have discussed before about lifting the sanctions that were imposed on Panama while Noriega was in charge.

Does the gentleman have any information on when those two might come to the floor?

Mr. GRAY. If the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is considering both of those items. I would say to the minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia, that there is considerable support on both sides of the aisle on both of those issues, and so what we are trying to do is to allow the regular process of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do its work and bring it in regular order to the floor so that the body may act on both of those issues.

□ 1730

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that information. I gather the gentleman does not know at the present time how rapidly they might produce those two?

Mr. GRAY. At this time we have no indication from the Committee on Foreign Affairs as to how soon that will occur, but we are hopeful that the order will proceed in a regular manner. We know there are many Members of the House on both sides of the aisle that would like to address those issues.

Mr. GINGRICH. Is it the intention of the gentleman on Tuesday to roll a vote, if one is requested on S. 1521, over to Wednesday, or will there be a vote on Tuesday?

Mr. GRAY. We think that a vote is unlikely at this time on that issue, so we think that there may not be a vote on Tuesday.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman helping us understand what the legislative business for next week will be. It is my understanding on our side that whenever the conferees are appointed for the oilspill bill, that it is very likely there will be a motion to instruct conferees which would lead to a recorded vote. Obviously if that appointment of conferees were made on Tuesday, Members might then be faced with a vote.

Does the gentleman know offhand if it is likely either on Tuesday or Wednesday conferees might be appointed?

Mr. GRAY. At this time I cannot tell the distinguished gentleman exactly when the conferees will be appointed. Knowing that that motion is in the offing and that there would be a vote, I am certain that the leadership on this side of the aisle will make sure that it is done in a manner so that people will be able to be present and to express their will on that motion to recommit.

Mr. GINGRICH. I was partly asking because we have a good colleague from New Jersey who has worked long and hard on that bill and desires to have that opportunity. I wanted to make sure that the gentleman would have more than enough notification if he needs to be here on either Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. GRAY. I can assure the distinguished gentleman he would have more than enough notification with regard to that issue, and, as has been done in the past, the Speaker would certainly consult with the minority so that any motions to recommit would be entertained properly and all persons would be notified so that the House can work its will.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and look forward to working with him next week.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1990

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, January 30, 1990, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, January 31, 1990.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DARDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain requests for 1 minute speeches.

VETO OVERRIDE OF H.R. 2712

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the veto override of H.R. 2712 and to praise my colleagues in the House for their overwhelming vote in support of the Chinese students in the United States. This legislation would allow Chinese students studying in the United States to remain here until they are able to return to their homeland free of fear from government persecution. In my view it would be simply unconscionable to force over 30,000 Chinese students back into the clutches of a repressive and murderous government. H.R. 2712 will provide comprehensive legal safeguards for these students, and, despite the President's statement that he can and will protect these students without additional legislation I believe that he was sorely misguided in vetoing the bill.

We have heard a great deal over the last decade about promoting freedom and democracy abroad. Unfortunately, China's own reform movement was brutally quashed last June in Tiananmen Square. Since that time the Chinese Government has shown little willingness to consider the democratic aspirations of its own people. Mr. President, despite your desire to maintain good relations with China, which I fully share, now is not the time to

pursue business as usual with that country. Chinese students living in the United States need the protection provided by this legislation. The message we send today in overriding the President's veto is the right message. The events at Tiananmen Square were barbaric, and have not been forgotten and should not be forgiven.

FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Ortega is pulling another stunt. He is holding hostage funds appropriated by Congress, blaming it on bureaucratic redtape. IPCE, the non-profit organization dedicated to recruiting and training opposition poll watchers, has not received their \$1.5 million in funds to operate. UNO has not received the funds or the office equipment and vehicles purchased by U.S. funds.

On October 4, 263 of us voted to give \$9 million as insurance that Nicaraguans have the opportunity to participate in the running of their government. The funds would help counterbalance the blatant use of government resources by the Sandinistas to maintain power.

Last week, I returned from Nicaragua cautiously optimistic over the preparations. Violeta Chamorro and the UNO opposition party have the hearts of the people with them.

What they do not have are resources. We fought a hard battle to obtain the funds for prodemocratic activities in Nicaragua, and the National Republican and Democratic institutes dodged many obstacles to send the funds to Nicaragua.

While Daniel Ortega is using government bureaucracy to hold up the release of opposition funds, I saw him give away nine new Soviet-made tractors and numerous tracts of land to those attending his rally. Do not tell me that FSLN campaign funds paid for those door prizes. And UNO can't even pay anything to those dedicated to assuring the ballot boxes aren't stuffed.

I met with representatives of the United Nations Observer Mission. They claim, and I'm sure you will agree, that if even 50 percent of the polls are without opposition watchers and the Sandinistas claim victory, no one will say the election was fair. Therefore, it is in Ortega's best interest to release our funds.

Ortega's latest ploy serves only to exemplify his fear of losing.

I saw UNO supporters turn out by the hundreds to show support for the Chamorro ticket. They are ready to

see a change in government and are sick of the repressive Sandinista regime. I hope you are as outraged as I that Daniel Ortega is trying to undermine the will of the Nicaraguan people.

CHINESE STUDENTS LEGISLATION VETO OVERRIDE

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, our vote today to override the President's veto of H.R. 2712, the bill protecting Chinese students from deportation, showed that this House is not confused by the administration's dubious justification of its veto—that the veto could appease China's leaders without in any way hurting or endangering Chinese students in this country.

Mr. Speaker, that is incredible and inconceivable on its face. Why oh why were China's leaders appeased by a veto that President Bush now says would have had no effect?

The reason China's aging tyrants were appeased by the President's veto is the very same reason that Chinese students here were mortally terrified by it: Both groups knew the protection provided by the Executive order alone—without the backing of law—could be tenuous and ephemeral, and could be revoked by the President at any time, just as easily as it was invoked by him.

Mr. Speaker, just as President Bush sent a message when he vetoed the bill, that many of us found unacceptable and offensive, this House today sent a message even more loud and clear, a message of freedom, that will reverberate from Washington, throughout this country, and all the way to the government halls of power in Beijing.

I enclose the eloquent editorial from today's New York Times:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1990]
ON CHINA, TRUST IS NOT ENOUGH

Congress now has an excellent opportunity to show Beijing, and President Bush, how the American people feel about the backward-looking policies of China's fading leaders, and the Administration's shameful apologetics on their behalf. It can do so by voting this week to override Mr. Bush's veto of a measure that could help guarantee Chinese students in this country a chance to stay.

The bill, originally sponsored by Representative Nancy Pelosi, California Democrat, passed both houses overwhelmingly. But the President, heeding Chinese demands, vetoed it last month, just as he sent his high-level aides off to China. For Congress to override would clearly signal that the American people are not yet ready for business as usual with the butchers of Beijing.

Any Administration is entitled to considerable leeway from Congress in the routine

conduct of foreign relations. And the Administration notes, correctly, that it has, by executive action, granted students the same right to apply for renewal of their visas without first returning home. But that just makes the veto look like a transparent attempt to appease Beijing.

China is anything but a routine foreign policy issue. Sino-American relations directly affect more than a billion people. They touch on a wide range of issues, including America's human rights standards, military cooperation between two nuclear powers and attitudes toward the murderous Khmer Rouge in Cambodia.

The right way for a President to handle such questions cannot be simply to say: Trust me, I'm an old China hand. Since the surprise December mission to Beijing, Americans have made plain their deep distrust of the President's China initiatives—even before the Administration admitted earlier high-level contacts with Chinese leaders. Can Congress now trust the permanence of executive remedies for the student visa problem?

By overriding the veto, Congress can nudge America's China policies back toward decency.

RELEASE OF FUNDS FOR NICARAGUA ELECTIONS

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Daniel Ortega and his Marxist/Sandinista government to get off the dime and start playing by the rules in Nicaragua.

The "dime" is actually more than \$1 million of United States money—money appropriated in good faith by this Congress to promote a free and fair election in Nicaragua next month—money that is desperately needed to recruit and train opposition poll watchers—money that has become bogged down in apparently endless Sandinista redtape.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from North Carolina, Mr. BALLENGER, and I spent 3 days in Nicaragua, talking with everyone from members of the U.N. observer team to church leaders to opposition leaders to plain, old citizens.

The message from all sides was unmistakable: There is an air of expectation that elections will happen. Real progress has been made in the struggle to conduct truly democratic elections in a country where such a thing is a novelty, but with that progress has come the potential for serious pitfall.

As he has done so often in the past, Daniel Ortega has shown himself adept at deliberate mischief making. He's using his power and total government control to thwart the process by withholding funds for poll watching and verification of registration.

Without opposition poll watchers at the more than 4,300 polling stations in Nicaragua, this election process will

make the brinks robbery look like petty larceny.

It's time for the Sandinistas to put our money where their mouths are—in the democratic election process they keep saying they support, a process the people of Nicaragua so clearly deserve.

□ 1740

TRIBUTE TO ALONZO A. SWANN

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and seek due recognition for World War II veteran Alonzo A. Swann, a great American hero.

During World War II, Alonzo Swann was a steward's mate assigned to man gun tub 10 as a crewmember of the U.S.S. *Intrepid*. On October 29, 1944, while patrolling off the Philippine Islands, the *Intrepid* was engaged by some of the first Japanese kamikaze planes. As the battle of Luzon raged on, a plane, bent on destruction, hurled at the *Intrepid's* flight deck in a kamikaze attempt. Alonzo Swann and the other steward's mates of gun tub 10 tried furiously to bring the plane down. Alonzo Swann continued to fire at the plane until it collided with the *Intrepid*.

The actions, above and beyond the call of duty, of Alonzo Swann and the other crewmembers of gun tub 10 were not in vain. Their relentless firing inflicted such great damage on the kamikaze plane that it was unable to maintain its course and instead it crashed directly into gun tub 10, sparing the *Intrepid* from fatal damage but causing fatal and serious injuries to the members of gun tub 10.

It was freely acknowledged that of all of the gun batteries that fired upon the Japanese plane, only the crew of gun tub 10 remained at their station, until the plane was brought down. All others, succumbing to the natural instinct for self-preservation, discontinued firing and sought the protection of the splinter shields—all save the stewards and steward's mates of gun tub 10.

For this act of bravery, which Assistant Chaplain Donald Ickes said was unequaled by any of the other considerable acts of heroism he had witnessed, the members of gun tub 10 were awarded the highest naval honor possible, the Navy Cross. For unknown reasons, this award was later downgraded to the bronze star.

Alonzo Swann, placed in a dire situation that most Americans will never know, answered his Nation's call of duty above the human instinct for self-preservation. By remaining at his station and risking his life when

others sought cover, he saved lives and protected his ship from crippling damage.

Alonzo Swann's first petition to be duly recognized for his bravery fell on the Navy's deaf ears. He is not satisfied, I am not satisfied, and the people of the United States of America should not be satisfied. The Navy has informed me that they have reopened Mr. Swann's case. I thank the Navy and strongly urge them to give him his long sought, just reward. Award Alonzo A. Swann the Navy Cross.

H.R. 3686, FAIR HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, before we recessed for the December break I introduced legislation which will stop discriminatory housing practices against senior citizens.

My legislation, H.R. 3686, eliminates a vague provision of the Fair Housing Act, which has placed a burdensome requirement on landlords of senior housing.

Under the law, a senior park can be declared a family park if it does not offer the proper amenities. Rather than face the possibility of a lawsuit, many landlords of senior parks have decided to open their projects to families.

My legislation would eliminate this requirement for such amenities, giving landlords and senior citizens a clearer idea of what exactly is required.

The bill does keep in place safeguards against discrimination by requiring senior housing to demonstrate an intention to be a seniors housing project by having 80 percent of the dwelling units occupied by one person over the age of 55.

I do not believe that it is fair to senior citizens to expect them to live in this state of limbo. By eliminating this provision the law will be clarified and landlords will be able to easily determine if they meet the regulations without having to go to court.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3683, and stop discrimination against senior housing.

LEVERAGED BUYOUTS LEAVE DEDICATED COMPANY EMPLOYEES WITHOUT JOBS OR INCOME

(Mr. DARDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I spoke of my alarm about the result of many leveraged buyouts during the last decade. Today, I want

to specifically mention one of these transactions.

Rich's, one of Atlanta's true retail institutions, finds itself owned by a holding company controlled by a corporate raider named Campeau who has filed for bankruptcy protection. Rich's is a profitmaking business and its employees work hard every day to provide quality goods and services to the general public. While Rich's has remained profitable, the parent company has an overlay of debt which cannot be overcome.

What is especially tragic is that our Tax Code provides an incentive for companies to go further into debt and discourages the accumulation of equity. Those who work should reap the rewards. However, leveraged buyouts leave dedicated company employees without jobs or income because corporate raiders have co-opted the company's assets for immediate personal profit.

We cannot continue to mortgage our future through corporate debt subsidized by the taxpayers.

LATIN AMERICA IS OUR NATURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMERCIAL TRADING PARTNER

(Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, freedom is bursting out all over the world. It is a marvelous sight to behold. We watched Central America, East Europe, Lebanon, South Africa, where progress is being made. But we need to remember our natural neighbors, Latin America. It is a historic alliance. It is politically right, it is morally correct, and they make a natural economic trading and commercial partner.

Everyone looks to 1992 in Europe, the little dragons of Asia and our troubled Middle East. But with our growing Spanish-speaking population in the United States, we need to remember to come home and have a vision, to come home and look ahead, to come home and make international progress by taking care of our natural geographic, historic partners, Latin America.

The whole world looks for exploding freedom in Europe; let us not forget our natural neighbors.

TRIBUTE TO MARTHA HICKS

(Mr. BUSTAMANTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize a constituent of mine, Martha Schultz Hicks, of San Antonio, TX. In November of 1989, Martha was presented the distin-

guished honor of being named "American Business Woman of the Year" by the American Business Women's Association [ABWA].

Each year the ABWA recognizes one of its member's professional achievements and community involvement and presents them with its highest award. I am not surprised that 1989's recipient was Martha.

I have known Martha since I was a county judge in San Antonio, Bexar County, and she has always been a leader in the community. Her unrelenting effort to help others has benefited those in San Antonio. Martha's devotion to education and her personal involvement in teaching others to achieve their goals has truly benefited the business community there.

So, today I would just like to say, "Congratulations and thank you Martha, for all you have achieved for yourself and for San Antonio."

REPLACING THE BERLIN WALL WITH A METAL FENCE

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a speech to members of East Germany's Volkskammer—or People's Parliament—in early January, Acting President Wolfgang Grlach, announced his intention to complete the dismantling of the wall. If you read the transcript of the speech you also learned of the intention to replace the soon-to-be downed wall, with a metal fence of some sort.

I was very interested to see that news reports of Mr. Grlach's speech did not contain any reference to the metal fence proposal. Perhaps no one wanted to "Jam a stick into the spokes" of what has universally been regarded as an extraordinary development—the tearing down of the Berlin Wall. The idea of replacing the wall with a fence was finally mentioned in a caption that accompanied a picture of East German workers removing a large segment of the Berlin Wall, in yesterday's New York Times.

I mention this little story because I am concerned about people who exhibit a dangerous penchant for hearing what they want to hear, they want to hear it. No one doubts the fact that the world is changing by leaps and bounds, and certainly we all want the seeds of democracy to flourish in East Germany, Poland, and Lithuania. However, events could very easily spin out of control. When and where, we don't know—nor does the Soviet leadership. In the meantime, let's not forget that approximately 560,000 Soviet troops still have their heels dug into East European soil.

INTRODUCTION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—MOST-FAVORED-NATION TRADING STATUS FOR ROMANIA

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a sense-of-the-Congress resolution calling on the President to immediately reextend most-favored-nation trading status to the country of Romania.

On December 17, 1989, the people of Romania, hungering for control over their own destinies, rose up en masse and, echoing events of our own country's establishment, entered into a bloody confrontation with forces of a tyrannical ruler which culminated on December 21 with the people throwing off the yoke of Ceausescu's oppression that had lain so heavy on their shoulders for the past 27 years. In establishing a transitional government, the people of Romania have set about the difficult and arduous task of righting the social, political, and economic wrongs inflicted upon them by the despotic Ceausescu regime. The task is not an easy one. The standard of living in Romania brought about by Ceausescu's policies is one of the lowest in Europe. For a fledgling government, struggling to incorporate democratic principles into its governing scheme and to survive and grow, its economic house must be put in order quickly, with an infusion of tangible capital and goods. However, for the economic impact of that assistance to be effective it must be based upon trade which creates jobs that are long lasting, rather than direct aid, which is fleeting.

Reinstituting the most-favored-nation trading status for Romania is the United States trade incentive best suited to meet these goals. That action, in my view, meets the goals of this fledgling government.

MFN has proven in the past to be a mutually beneficial trading instrument between the United States and Romania as well as an instrument to effectuate social and political change in Romania—however minimal it might previously have been.

In 1975, Romania was granted most-favored-nation trading status as a way of rewarding and promoting its demonstrated political independence from the Soviet Union. Since the mid-1960's, Romania has sought to institute external policies which are consistent with its own view of its national interests. For example, Romania:

- Condemned the invasion of Czechoslovakia;

- Criticized the invasions of Afghanistan and Kampuchea;

- Was the only Warsaw Pact country to recognize Israel;

- Refused to endorse anti-U.S. name calling resolutions in the United Nations;

- Insisted upon having relationships independent of U.S.S.R. with China, West Germany, Israel, and the United States;

- Did not participate in Warsaw Pact troop maneuvers outside its borders;

- Resisted Soviet efforts to integrate the East European and Soviet economies;

- Was the only Warsaw Pact country to conduct more than 50 percent of its trade with the non-Communist world.

Following the extension of MFN status to Romania, trade between that country and the United States expanded fourfold from \$450 million in 1975 to \$1.2 billion in 1985, before declining in later years due to the economic policies of the Ceausescu regime. Leading U.S. exports were agricultural products, including corn and soybeans, coal, power generating equipment, fertilizer, animal skins, and pulp waste. Topping the imports from Romania were petroleum products, clothing, iron and steel products, footwear, and furniture. It is estimated that at its height, trade with Romania generated some 12,000 jobs within the United States.

The two governments constructed a framework conducive to the expansion of trade and economic cooperation. In addition to granting MFN in 1975, the United States supported the expansion of American exports to Romania by determining Romania's eligibility for United States export financing programs. Romania has utilized Eximbank lending programs and Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] credits, aggregating over \$1 billion in U.S. Government-backed credits since 1975 (about \$800 million through the CCC and \$200 million through the Eximbank). Beginning in 1976, Romania also enjoyed special tariff preferences under the Generalized System of Preferences [GSP] Program which the United States extends to developing countries. Under the GSP Program, over \$700 million in goods from Romania entered the United States between 1976 and 1987, at which point Romania was stripped of its GSP privileges.

Under the MFN, 30 United States firms set up sales offices in Romania. For instance, Control Data Corp. entered into a joint venture to manufacture computer peripherals for sale in Romania, Eastern Europe and the West.

However economic conditions for Romania began to go sour in 1981, brought about by past economic mismanagement, the international credit squeeze, the adjustment of the economy to slower growth, and a restructuring of the world oil and refined petroleum products market, which made a large segment of Romania's exports industry unprofitable. Faced with

enormous internal economic difficulties and a rising foreign debt the nation launched an enormous austerity drive. Because of these factors and Ceausescu's drive to eliminate Romania's external debt, imports were cut-back drastically and personal consumption for the general public was cut to a bare minimum.

The cost to Romanians was tremendous, as living standards fell abysmally, particularly in the availability of food and energy. A refusal to contemplate economic reforms and excessively severe financial austerity measures drove living standards to their lowest level since the mid-1950's. Bucharest was the darkest and coldest capital city in Europe. This further erosion of the standard of living added to the growing public unrest which had been fueled by the repressive social measures instituted by the Ceausescu regime.

Long known for its human rights violations, the Ceausescu regime received increasing attention for its repression of religious liberties, freedom of speech, free emigration and other such deplorable acts against the human spirit and body.

The extension of MFN has proven to be an effective tool for social reforms within Romania.

The granting of MFN status to Romania was conditioned upon its compliance with provisions of the 1974 Trade Act, known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment. These provisions, entitled "Freedom of Emigration in East-West Trade," which principally make nonmarket economy countries ineligible for nondiscriminatory tariff treatment upon a determination that "such country denies its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate."

Because of its economic importance to Romania, the potential for loss of MFN status due to a failure to comply with Jackson-Vanik had proven an important bargaining tool in United States dealings with Romania on its emigration and other human rights policies. Under this MFN leverage there had been a distinct improvement in Romanian emigration performance. The 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment links extension of MFN with performance in the area of freedom of emigration. As a matter of fact, the leverage afforded by annual review has been effective in producing a rate of emigration from Romania comparable to that of all the other Warsaw Pact countries combined, excluding East Germany. The average emigration rate from Romania to the United States, Israel, and West Germany nearly tripled in the decade following the extension of MFN, including a sevenfold increase in emigration to the United States. Over 154,000 Romanians—roughly 1 in 160 of the country's current population—have departed the country legally

since MFN was granted. Moreover, under MFN leverage, procedures for emigration have been eased and some of the hardships encountered by individuals applying for immigration, such as harassment by the secret police, loss of employment, loss of housing, and the denial of access to social services had been alleviated.

Annual MFN review had helped the United States highlight individual human rights cases, and in some instances resolved them in a positive manner. However these instances were few and slow in being completed.

Congress, growing ever critical of the repressive Ceausescu regime and the deliberate lack of progress in its movement toward human rights reforms, sought to impose further stringent human rights conditions in its granting of a Jackson-Vanik waiver for an extension of MFN to Romania in 1988. Unwilling to accept the prospect of further conditions being imposed on his government, Ceausescu unilaterally withdrew his country's participation in the extension of MFN by the United States. Specifically, Ceausescu sought to avoid the imposition of further conditions by the United States that his government effect meaningful democratic reforms within Romania.

Finally, in December 1989, the Romanian people, faced with a bleak existence at best, and hounded by Ceausescu's police squads, deprived of the most basic human rights, and forced to exist on an inhuman standard of living, decided they had had enough and moved to take their destiny into their own hands, and like our Founding Fathers some 200 years ago, rose up and overthrew the despotic and repressive regime. We all watched this on television with wonder, as history unfolded before our eyes.

Since the overthrow of Ceausescu, the transitional government has struggled valiantly to overcome the problems stemming from the creation of a new government, right the social wrongs of the past regime, and foster an economic climate that will provide an improved standard of living for its downtrodden people. It has been, and will continue to be, a very difficult task indeed.

I am reminded of the creation of America's democracy, when at our darkest hour we sent three emissaries—among them Benjamin Franklin, to a political and economic giant of the times seeking support in our efforts toward freedom and self-determination. With the swipe of a pen, France, legitimized and recognized the fledgling government that was to become the United States of America. France's signing of the Economic Treaty of 1778 provided our country with the economic means to continue our struggle with Great Britain, was the first economic recognition of our country, and provided our forefathers

with a critical opportunity to further establish the internal foundation upon which our democracy would be built. In other words, France provided crucial support toward the success of our young government in providing what would today be referred to as an extension by France of most-favored-nation trading status to the United States.

We stand at a very critical juncture in time, faced with an opportunity that is not dissimilar to the situation facing France in 1788. We have the opportunity to extend our hand to a fledgling government and offer nation-sustaining aid and assistance in considering the reextension of U.S. MFN trade status to a people that have beaten overwhelming odds in successfully throwing off the yoke of tyranny.

After ejecting the Ceausescu regime from power, the interim government has already extended full religious freedoms and the freedom of speech to the people of Romania, and has further stated its strong desire to right the wrongs of the former regime. No less important from our perspective is the fact that the interim government has announced its clear intention to hold free and open elections on May 20, 1990, this year.

For practical purposes, there are two criteria which must be met prior to the extension of MFN to any country.

First, the United States must have a valid trade agreement with the candidate country. In the case of Romania, a bilateral trade agreement was entered into in 1975, and will not expire until August of this year.

Second, the candidate country must be in compliance with the Jackson-Vanik free emigration provisions of the Trade Act of 1974. Again, in the case of Romania, and as I have already stated, there now exists within Romania de facto free emigration. Moreover, the interim government has announced its intention to provide for free emigration by law.

We have before us an opportunity to extend a hand of friendship and support to the people of Romania in their struggle for freedom and self-determination. This gesture of good faith and acknowledgment of legitimacy by the leading power of the free world would send a powerful message to the people of Romania. It would tell the Romanians that Americans support them in their struggle, that we trust their commitment to the cause at hand, and that they have a friend in the West. It also sends a similarly important message to the thousands of individuals and corporations in the United States and throughout the free world whose capital investment in Romania will provide the economic foundation upon which their new government will be built. That message is clearly stated in

the resolved clause of the resolution introduced today which reads:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should move immediately to provide for the extension of Most Favored Nation trading status, and seek to offer other such means of indirect economic assistance to Romania as an expression of confidence in the Romanian people and their new government, and to reward, promote, aid and assist the Romanian people in their struggle for independence and freedom.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important resolution, and in moving it quickly to the floor.

□ 1750

APPLY PRESSURE TO HAITIAN DICTATORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DARDEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about my concern for the double standard of the U.S. foreign policy, especially when it is applied in the Western Hemisphere. Specifically, I am concerned about the overreaction in Panama and the lack of action in the case of Haiti.

The invasion of Panama was illegal, brutal, and unnecessary. A great nation like the United States should never sink to the barbaric level of a thug like Manuel Noriega. A superpower should never allow itself to be goaded into a state of macho hysteria by a petty tyrant who is also a maniac. Innocent Panamanians and United States soldiers should not have had to die to accomplish a task which more patience and creative pressure could have accomplished.

They are going to make a deal, Mr. Speaker. They are going to make a deal anyhow. Manuel Noriega's trial will never go to its end. The monster deal makers, Mr. Noriega, the DA, and the CIA, the Justice Department, will now sit down and make a deal. The invasion of Panama failed. They brought Noriega out alive. They wanted him dead. Noriega alive is an embarrassment to the United States. They will now sit down and make a deal. Noriega's trial will result in the kind of deal that could have been made without all the killing and the unnecessary dying.

Too many civilians in Panama died because the monster deal makers could not make the deal in advance, and many in the communities, and the people in Panama that suffered the most devastation from the invasion were poor people and black people. The whole question of race in Panama has never been discussed at all in this

situation, and it is important that it be looked at. I represent the largest community of Panamanians outside of Florida. They are all glad to see Noriega go. They are all mourning the human and material losses experienced, but most of my constituents are black Panamanians, and they are worried about their civil rights and their human rights, worried about a return to the kind of oppression that existed against black people before Noriega.

Noriega, like many other tyrants, was clever enough to see that the oppressed people are the ones that he could win over and make loyal to him, so he did a great deal for the black people of Panama. They still are glad to see Noriega go. The problem is now they need relief. They need government aid. They need private aid. They need long-term assistance in terms of building the country on a whole, but certainly those communities that suffered most need assistance from the government and the people who are generous enough to know that a large amount of devastation took place. Food is needed immediately. Clothing is needed immediately. Most of all, some recognition of the long-term obligation that the United States has to Panama that is needed.

There were black people who built the Panama Canal who have never been compensated fully for their contribution. They are worried about the United States invasion of Grenada, and the fact that Grenada in 1983 when invaded was in much better shape economically. Grenada is now a basket case. On the other hand, they are worried about the fact there will be a total lack of recognition of their dilemma. All of our attention will be focused on Eastern Europe, on El Salvador, on places where we have special interests, but are not concerned about democracy, necessarily. We are more concerned about democracy in Eastern Europe than in our own hemisphere, right here in Haiti.

Haiti is a situation where the United States has a tremendous amount of influence. Consistently, this administration has taken a soft approach on Haiti. We are again faced in Haiti with another escalation of the lack of freedom. Another election was scheduled, so it prompted the present dictators of Haiti to start a new reign of terror. They have expelled the man who wrote the constitution for that new election, Prosper Avril, now coddled by the U.S. Government because they do not speak against him. Money has been covertly sneaked to the Haitians. They are surviving.

The administration would not survive for 6 months if the United States would take a hostile attitude toward the terror there. The United States has more power and influence over political and human rights abuse in Haiti than it has in any other nation. The

present administration's dictators there could not exist if we do not want them to exist. We should show the Haitian military regime with the new reign of terror that the U.S. Government means business about democracy all over the world, and democracy in this hemisphere, and cut off all aid to Haiti, even humanitarian aid. The government is able to survive upon any money we send to Haiti, and takes advantage of food sent to children. This is a government with no scruples and no morality, a government which is preparing another crisis for the United States in its war against drugs.

Drug runners are using Haiti. Haiti is a major drop-off point, still. In order to finance a military action, where they cannot get money from the United States, they turn to the drug runners. If we mean business about fighting drugs, we do not need to invade Haiti. We can just apply pressure. In 6 months that pressure, if applied through the right channels, would bring down the oppressive government of Haiti.

Our double standard is such that we ignore what is happening on this island, which is just 90 miles off the shore of the United States. Is it a double standard because of race? Is it a double standard because they have no Communist party? We just ignore the human rights there. There are 5 million people there, and I hope we end the double standard. In addition to providing the kind of aid and assistance for Panama, it deserves to have pressure on Haiti. Bring down the government of Haiti and allow human rights to flourish there, and real democracy to take place in Haiti.

PRESIDENTIAL SCIENCE ADVISER'S ROLE IN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSTAMANTE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation which directs the President's Science Adviser to take the lead in coordinating Federal policy to improve math and science education in this country.

The need for such legislation is apparent given our Nation's projected "shortfall of 560,000 scientists and engineers by the year 2010." This shortfall is aggravated by the underrepresentation of minorities, the handicapped, and women in science, all of whom will constitute, in the aggregate, 85 percent of the work force by the year 2000. [Washington Post, Jan. 9, 1990, p. A17]

What we have, therefore, is a two-prong problem: On the one hand, we currently don't have enough scientists and engineers for research and development purposes; and on the other hand, the future pool of working-age

Americans who could possibly fill that gap have been traditionally underrepresented in those fields. To ensure our Nation's economic competitiveness, it is incumbent upon us as legislators to find ways of increasing the representation of women and minorities in science and engineering. This point is eloquently made by National Science Director Erich Bloch who has stated publicly that:

The large numbers of minorities and women in the country provide an opportunity—one we cannot afford to miss. Our motive should be pragmatism as much as altruism—the need to develop all our human resources.

My own recognition of the relation of minority education initiatives to our Nation's economic security is what prompted me to introduce, on March 22 of last year, H.R. 1561, The Hispanic-Serving Institutions of Higher Education Act of 1989. My distinguished colleague and senior Senator from Texas, Finance Chairman LLOYD BENTSEN introduced the companion bill, S. 1669, on September 22 of last year. Senator BENTSEN and I introduced this legislation because we believe that in this age of constant technological advances and increasing global competition, our educational system is faced with a tremendous challenge that the Congress must help that system to meet. That's one of the reasons why I included a provision in H.R. 1561 which would authorize postsecondary institutions to increase the representation of Hispanic-Americans in math, science, and engineering, for although "Hispanics comprise 9 percent of the population * * * only 2 percent of all employed scientists and engineers" are Hispanic.

In fact, increasing representation of Hispanic-Americans in these fields was one of the specific strategies outlined in a Federal report entitled—"Changing America: The New Face of Science and Engineering."

That was the title of the final report of the task force on women, minorities, and the handicapped in science and technology, which was statutorily established during the 99th Congress for the purpose of issuing recommendations on how to shore up our scarcity of workers with scientific expertise.

The same task force recommended that the Federal Government take the lead in launching programs to help the American education system to improve math and science instruction:

The Federal Government is the largest single employer of scientists and engineers. It finances one-half of all research and development performed in the United States. It has a special responsibility to be a pacesetter.

By taking the lead in math and science promotion, the Federal Government would be indirectly encouraging private industry and State and local government to do the same. Some of

the programs envisioned under this initiative is the loaning of Federal scientists to teach at elementary and secondary schools under alternative teacher certification plans as well as the offering of job cooperatives with Federal entities engaged in scientific research. The Department of Energy and NASA are among some of the more prominent Federal Department and agencies which are currently engaged in developing such programs.

While all of these initiatives are promising and exciting, there is one major flow that afflicts them all: Not enough Federal policy coordination.

The need to make Federal policy on math and science education a high priority is clearly underscored in the task force's report. Accordingly to the task force, Federal policy in these educational areas should be made and coordinated at the Presidential level due to the President's "broad, strong, and immediate" influence. This is the principal reason why the task force specifically requested that the President:

Direct the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy to establish a Federal coordination committee for science, engineering and technology to provide visibility, coordination, and accountability for Federal agency plans to strengthen the science and engineering work force.

I believe this recommendation is probably one of the most important made by the task force, because it touches on a crucial point: The need for better coordination between the various Federal departments and agencies in promoting science education.

This is precisely the rationale for my legislation, which focuses visibility on math and science by statutorily authorizing the President's Science Adviser to act as the chief coordinator of Federal efforts to enhance math and science education at all levels.

Under this authorization, the President's Science Adviser would not only be able to establish a coordination committee as requested by the task force, but his office would be permanently charged with the task of promoting math and science education. Making this a permanent charge of the Science Adviser, and clearly outlining what that charge entails, is crucial to ensuring that our Nation has the necessary manpower resources to maintain its economic competitiveness beyond this new decade and into the 21st century.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. For those Members interested in this legislation, I submit a copy of my bill for the RECORD.

H.R. 3853

A bill requiring the Office of Science and Technology Policy to coordinate and evaluate Federal efforts to promote and assist mathematics and science education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. POLICY PLANNING; ANALYSIS; ADVICE

Section 205 (a) of the Presidential Science and Technology Advisory Organization Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6614(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (12);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

"(13) coordinate Federal policy designed to improve the instruction of mathematics and science at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels, and assess how the various Federal departments and agencies can assist and encourage American students to pursue postsecondary study in mathematics, science, engineering, and other technology-related disciplines which may be of vital importance in enhancing our Nation's economic competitiveness; and".

SEC. 2. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY REPORT AND OUTLOOK.

Section 206(a) of the Presidential Science and Technology Advisory Organization Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6615(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (5);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end of the following new paragraph:

"(7) an evaluation of Federal efforts to enhance mathematics and science education, including an assessment of the effectiveness of Federal programs designed to assist in increasing our Nation's manpower resources in mathematics, science, engineering, and other technology-related disciplines.".

LEGISLATION TO EXTEND DUTY SUSPENSION ON CERTAIN TEXTILE EQUIPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DARDEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to extend for a period of 5 years the existing duty suspension on heat-set stretch texturing textile equipment.

My district is home to more than 40,000 textile employees with 20,000 employed in one county alone—Gaston County. I cannot stress how important textiles are to the economic well-being of rural North Carolina.

The yarn spinners industry is an integral segment of this larger textile family on whose behalf I have introduced this legislation. The machinery in question is designed for heat-set, stretch texturing of continuous manmade fibers. The textured yarns are major components in various kinds of apparel and home furnishings.

As required of all duty suspension bills, there are no domestic producers of the texturing equipment. In fact, the last domestic supplier of this machinery ceased production in 1973.

Today, the senior Senator from North Carolina, Senator JESSE HELMS, is introducing identical legislation in the Senate. I am proud to associate myself with all segments of the textile industry and urge my colleagues on the Trade Subcommittee to consider this bill for inclusion in the miscellaneous tariff and trade legislation.

THE EXIMBANK ESTABLISHES A LOAN LOSS RESERVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, after many years of unflattering reports from the General Accounting Office [GAO] and repeated calls to action, the Export-Import Bank of the United States [Eximbank] announced on January 4 the creation of \$4.8 billion reserve to cover possible losses on 40 percent of its outstanding loans and guarantees. As the author of similar legislation (H.R. 3608) during the 100th Congress, I am delighted by the Eximbank's decision to establish the reserve. The loan loss requirement retroactively took effect to September 30, 1989.

Eximbank's refusal to account for loan losses hampered the ability of this key Federal export agency to operate vigorously. Without real-world accounting, Eximbank loan and guarantee losses would likely escalate, and restrict the U.S. role in present and future foreign development. Establishing a loan loss reserve is crucial for this reason—and especially important in light of a 1987 GAO report stating that discounted Eximbank loan sales may result in substantial losses for the agency in the years in which they are sold. At least now the impact of any Eximbank loan sales will be minimal, since the losses are already recognized in the reserve. Hopefully, this action will also boost the long-term financial condition of the Eximbank. As before, the Eximbank will continue to borrow funds from the Federal Financing Bank for new loans and expand its activities during this period of expansion in the world economy.

As a close observer of the Eximbank, I do not believe its best interests were served by previous annual fiscal reports which gave overly rosy but inaccurate assessments of its condition. While the new governments of Eastern Europe are looking to America for help in restructuring their economies, for instance, Congress simply cannot afford to make decisions about the Eximbank based on misleading information. Reporting the Eximbank loan loss reserve will clearly also help Congress ensure that the American people are getting their money's worth by clarifying their cost in financing export sales.

Legislation passed in the first session of the Congress, the "International Development and Finance Act" (Public Law 101-240), requires the Eximbank to submit a report on why it has persisted in not establishing a loan loss reserve. I am extremely pleased that the Eximbank Board and Chairman went one step further and created the actual reserve. After years of stonewalling by the Eximbank on this matter, new Chairman John Macomber deserves praise for his leadership in improving the fair representation of its financial status.

As a strong supporter of the Eximbank and its mission, I am confident that its adoption of real-world bookkeeping at this crucial juncture will help dissuade critics and opponents during upcoming debates on funding for its export assistance programs.

AN EXHILARATING, FASCINATING, CHALLENGING DECADE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today, on January 24, 1980, I was sworn in as a Member of this great body, the first member to be elected in the new decade of the eighties.

It has been an exhilarating, fascinating, challenging ten years, filled with joy and accomplishment, as well as with struggle and frustration.

I have had the support of a wonderful staff—the best of any Member of Congress—both at home and here in Washington. They do me and our country proud every day, and to me, represent the face of the committed, dedicated people of Government that all our citizens ought to have the chance to see.

I have had the support of my partner, the light of my life, my wife, Kathryn, who not only headed my staff during the early years, but has provided inspiration, ideas, and leadership every day of the decade.

I thank the wonderful people whom I am privileged to represent and my country for the opportunity to serve in this magnificent hall of human freedom. I hope that they will see fit to allow me to continue to do so.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives that January 22 marked the 72d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. On January 22, 1918, independence from Russian domination was proudly proclaimed in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, by the Ukrainian Central Rada, the parliament of the people of Ukraine, and 1 year later, the Act of Union joined western and eastern Ukraine into one Ukrainian National Republic.

During the 3 years which followed this declaration of independence, the industrious Ukrainian people made tremendous progress toward developing a stable and democratic government, despite constant pressure at the hands of the Bolsheviks. Unfortunately, however, by 1922, the Bolsheviks took control, and the Ukrainians entered a dark period of oppression and persecution.

During the barbaric years of Stalin's rule, the Ukrainians witnessed mass starvations, evacuations, and deportations, as the Soviets attempted to destroy the national identity of the Ukrainian people. However, the Soviets were not able to crush their spirit and their great desire to achieve independence and self-determination.

Today a wave of freedom is sweeping over all of the republics which have long been under the domination of Soviet rule. Millions of Ukrainians who have fought to preserve their

cultural and religious heritage are bravely rising up to demand that their country may once again join the community of free nations.

The Popular Movement of Ukraine for Perebudova, an organization founded only a few months ago, now boasts hundreds of thousands of members dedicated to the cause of freedom. In an inspiring display of unity to commemorate Ukrainian Independence Day, on Sunday more than 100,000 people formed a human chain stretching 300 miles from the Ukrainian capital of Kiev, westward to the Ukrainian city of Lvov.

A few months ago, the Library of Congress sponsored an exhibit to commemorate the 175th anniversary of the birth of the great Ukrainian national poet, Taras Shevchenko. I visited this exhibit, and as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, I was delighted that the Library appropriately highlighted the magnificent writings of this truly outstanding Ukrainian author, choosing from its collection of more than 70,000 Ukrainian books which preserve the rich cultural, religious, social, economic, and national history of the Ukrainian people.

Mr. Speaker, on this 72d anniversary of Ukraine's proclamation of independence, I am proud to join with Americans of Ukrainian descent in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am honored to represent, and Ukrainian-Americans throughout the United States, in commemorating this stirring event in the history of free nations.

We in Congress must continue to press the Soviets at every opportunity to restore freedom for the downtrodden, and as a Member of Congress, I remain committed to devote my efforts tirelessly until the Ukraine is a democratic nation, free from the tyranny, and domination of the Communists.

INTRODUCTION OF MEDICARE BENEFIT IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1990 BY 53 HOUSE MEMBERS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Medicare Benefit Improvements Act of 1990. I am pleased that my distinguished colleagues, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MADIGAN and an additional 49 original cosponsors have joined together to introduce this important new bill.

The Medicare Benefit Improvements Act would provide a modest yet essential expansion of Medicare benefits. The bill would improve the Medicare benefit package to cover and expand four services: mammography, home health care screening, respite, and hospice.

Over the course of the past several years, there have been numerous congressional hearings and studies that confirm the value of these benefits. As a direct result, the benefits were included in the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988. Unfortunately, when Congress repealed the act, these benefits were also eliminated.

The bill would cover mammography screening for elderly and disabled Medicare benefici-

aries. The clinical benefits of mammography screening have been confirmed by the scientific community. This preventive service is projected to save 4,000 lives per year.

Under the provisions of the proposed legislation, women ages 65 and older would be eligible for biennial mammography screening. Disabled beneficiaries would be eligible for a baseline screening with subsequent annual screenings for high-risk disabled beneficiaries between the ages of 40 and 49, and all disabled women between ages 50 and 64.

The bill would also expand the Medicare home health benefit to cover daily services for up to 38 days. This benefit is particularly important to frail, elderly Medicare beneficiaries, many of whom need home health services to recover from illness, regain strength, and improve their functional abilities, often following a hospital episode.

In-home respite services would also be provided by the proposed legislation. Caregivers of chronically dependent, homebound Medicare beneficiaries would be allowed up to 80 hours per year of respite. This benefit is essential to caregivers whose efforts make it possible for severely impaired beneficiaries to remain in their homes and avoid institutionalization.

Finally, the Medicare hospice benefit would be improved by eliminating the 210-day lifetime limit for Medicare covered hospice care.

These new benefits would be fully financed by a modest increase in the part B premium. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the part B premium would increase by approximately 80 cents per month in 1991, increasing to only \$1.30 per month 5 years after the program is fully implemented. This modest premium increase would fund the full cost of these new benefits.

Because premiums would be set to fund the full cost of these new benefits, the proposal is financed on a Gramm-Rudman deficit neutral basis.

This proposal is endorsed by a number of national organizations, including The American Cancer Society, the American Association of Retired Persons, the Older Women's League, Families USA, the National Association for Home Care, Hospice Association of America, and the National Alliance of Breast Cancer Organizations.

I urge you to join us as cosponsors of this legislation and push for its swift consideration before the conclusion of the 101st Congress.

AMERICAN OPPORTUNITIES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak this evening about American opportunities. Last night I talked briefly about the concept of an American opportunities workshop on May 19. This is the idea of having a 90-minute program by satellite television available to anyone in America, either through their local cable programs or because they were able to get access to a dish receiver or to a hotel

that has a down link or to a school or to a church.

I talked about the concept of having 90 minutes by which by television we would outline a new way of thinking about solving problems, a new way of looking at American opportunities, and a new way of developing answers for America's future, of focusing on the concept of developing 21st century citizenship by focusing on new solutions for the nineties; and the idea that anyone could participate that could develop their own site and they could be involved. I thought that I might explain why we decided we could develop an American opportunities workshop, and why we think that is an important idea.

We started with a concept that Thomas Kuhn, in a book called *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*, first made popular. Kuhn argued that science could be thought of as a series of very big ideas, what he called paradigms, and a paradigm was a way of thinking about something.

Sir Isaac Newton, in thinking about the concept of gravity had developed a new paradigm, a new way of approaching things, which then solved a lot of problems for scientists and for physicists.

Then shortly after Sir Isaac Newton—not so shortly by politicians' time but shortly by a historian's time—people like Max Planck and Albert Einstein came along, and they developed the concept of relativity and of quantum mechanics. And that again became a new model, a new way of thinking about physics.

What Thomas Kuhn discovered was that by focusing on these basic changes we saw a big change in science. Recently we saw, for example, the concept of shift in geology in the late fifties, with the development of the idea of plate tectonics, the fact that the continents actually move.

□ 1810

Mr. Speaker, everybody today agrees that they move very slowly and over a very long period of time, but everybody agrees that the continents moved over the last several billion years and that that is part of what explains, for example, the Himalaya and Mount Everest, is the coming together of two of these plates. So, the concept of paradigm is the concept of a big idea.

Mr. Speaker, most politicians and most of the news does not deal with big ideas. It deals with a series of small, day-to-day events; small, day-to-day activities which occur within a large concept, a larger construct.

In the 19th century a big idea came along, what was called the national insurance state, in Germany. Bismarck, the German political leader, first developed it, and the idea was that people could be taxed to organize a bureaucracy and that the bureaucracy

would provide insurance, and health care and other activities better than the private market. At its peak in the United States under Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the New Deal, and then ultimately under Lyndon Johnson in the Great Society, the concept of what became in the modern world the bureaucratic welfare state was a powerful model, was a way of saying, "We'll take some money from everybody in the form of taxes, we'll organize them together in a bureaucracy, and we'll return for your money services which will be better than you could have bought had you done it in the private market."

Mr. Speaker, it was a very popular idea, and it seemed to work for a long time. However, that paradigm, or model of the bureaucratic welfare state, when combined in the late sixties with the values of the left, created a pattern which simply failed. It turned out that the Great Society in its modern form did not work, that that bureaucracy became more and more bound in red tape, more and more bound up in work rules, that it became harder and harder to do positive things and that, in fact, we were faced with a situation in which the average citizen was less and less able to get their needs met, and they were more and more dominated by and controlled by a large bureaucracy which did not care about them.

There is an interesting pattern, if one reads, for example, the Chicago Tribune's brilliant series on education in Chicago. Read about the school-teacher who said, having had four principals attempt to fire her for being incompetent, never having successfully been fired because the bureaucratic work rules were such that she literally was invulnerable to any of her principals, and, when asked what her educational goal was, she said that it was to retire with a full pension, clearly not what anybody had in mind when they created schools and when they created education and having nothing to do with the well-being of the children.

Mr. Speaker, I was told last night by one New York reporter that to the best of this knowledge in the last 10 years, in all of the eighties, in New York City, because of the work rules, and because of the union contracts, and because of the bureaucracy no principal had been fired in a 10-year period. I cannot vouch for that from firsthand knowledge.

We are asking that the research be done. But it was a stunning concept, and it made sense given the general feeling most people have about how large big city bureaucracy functions.

I was told that only two teachers have been fired for cause, which meant that there were literally people who had been convicted of child molestation who were teaching in schools because it was harder to get them

fired, so hard to get them fired, that, in fact, it was easier to simply collapse, and lose will and lose morale.

We see these kinds of examples again and again, whether it is waste in the Pentagon, waste in the Medicare and Medicaid Program, waste in the New York City bureaucracy. The whole structure of the modern bureaucratic welfare state seems to build in patterns, and habits and activities which, at their best, are extraordinarily wasteful and inefficient, and at their worst they are simply very, very corrupt.

So, I think it is fair to argue that the paradigm of the bureaucratic welfare state and the values of the left have simply failed. This first began to be obvious, ironically, at its very peak under Lyndon Johnson as he founded the Great Society and the first generation of a populist movement. A movement created in large part by William Buckley, by Barry Goldwater, and by Ronald Reagan began to evolve even as the bureaucratic welfare state reached its highest mark. Over the following 25 years it became more and more obvious that raising taxes to hire more bureaucrats to set up more programs to process more paper was simply not working. It was not giving Americans the goods and services they wanted. It was not providing them the future they needed.

And the Presidential election results began to follow that indication. As recently as 3 years after the Great Society began in 1965, in 1968, the left lost an election by a decisive margin, and its candidate got only 42 percent in the general election. By 1972 the left dropped to 38 percent in its vote. In 1976 the left had been so discredited that its nominee could not be found in either party, and, in fact, both candidates for President in 1976 were seen as right of center with Jimmy Carter, ironically, being seen as slightly more conservative on social policy than Gerald Ford, and so the result was that there was not even a leftwing candidate. By 1980 Carter was clearly seen as the candidate of the left, and he dropped to 41 percent. By 1984 Reagan was faced with an opponent who was calling for higher taxes, who was one of the most honorable and legitimate advocates of the modern bureaucratic welfare state, and Walter Mondale was defeated with 41 percent. In 1988 a man who was in some ways attempting to develop a new, more technologically favorable approach, who was trying to be a little different than the traditional liberal Democrat, nonetheless went down to defeat, and Michael Dukakis just got 46 percent, and, as I quoted last night, Dukakis himself has indicated that one of the lessons he has learned out of his years as Governor of Massachusetts is that every basic fundamental achievement

of the eighties has to be rethought in a very basic way, and, coming from Governor Dukakis, that was a very interesting and, I think, very revealing example of the collapse of the old paradigm of the bureaucratic welfare state and of the values of the left.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some people, despite that evidence that it is no longer popular, will still argue intellectually that the bureaucratic welfare state will work, that the values of the left will work if only they can get enough money, if only they can raise taxes on the American people, if only somehow government can receive enough resources. Yet the fact is New York City's budget is approximately \$25 billion. Let me repeat that. The city of New York by itself, this New York City budget for government service in New York City, is about \$25 billion in government services. That is about 300,000 full-time employees. Now one might argue that at \$25 billion a year and 300,000 full-time employees a year that maybe we could have a better run, safer, better educated, healthier, and cleaner New York City. That would argue that the current model does not work, or one could argue that, despite the union work rules, despite the bureaucracy, despite the red tape, if only we had 2, or 3, or 4 billion more, New York City would work, and I think that is going to be one of the major arguments in America in the nineties. Those people who believe that New York City is fundamentally a sound model, that the bureaucratic welfare state essentially works, that the values of the left can, in fact, be applied with effective success, those folks are going to argue, "Let's raise taxes and finance the old order," and I think that is a fair position, and I think that will be the general position of people on the left, but, when realizing that it is not just a question of New York City having \$25 billion, all government and America, from local school boards, to county commissioners, to sheriffs, to city government, to State government, to the Federal Government, all governments in 1986 spent \$1 trillion 700 billion. That is the government part of the way we run America was \$1 trillion 700 billion.

Mr. Speaker, a trillion is a lot of money. A billion used to be a lot of money when I was young, but we are now moving into the age of the trillions. Let me explain how much money a trillion is. A million dollars, if I had up here on this table a thousand million dollars, that would be a billion. That would be a lot of money. A trillion is one million million dollars. So, when we talk about a trillion dollars, we are talking about a million million dollars. So, we are talking at one point seven trillion dollars, which is the spending of all governments in America. We are talking about one million 700 thousand units of a million dollars

each, and I would argue that probably that is enough, that probably, if we organize government right, if we did things as efficiently as possible, if we applied values that worked, if we were willing to rethink the bureaucracy and apply modern computers and modern information technology, that probably at a trillion 700 billion dollars we could get a lot done.

□ 1820

But that is real money. We find, in fact, when you start looking at the tale of the eighties that the answers of the traditional left and the answers of the traditional bureaucratic welfare state do not quite work. It turns out, for example, that in the mideighties education expenses went up dramatically. They went up dramatically because of the State and local level people who were raising taxes and spending far more money, and it turns out that there is no direct relationship between the amount of money spent and the amount of learning that took place.

I think it is no accident, for example, that if you look at some of the most expensive school systems in America, New York City, Detroit, Chicago, Washington, DC, they are abject failures. If you look at the school systems of America which have the lowest level of State aid, New Hampshire, it has the highest level of scholastic aptitude test scores. I think in part that is because in New Hampshire they have kept the cost of education at home so that parents and local citizens pay for it, parents and local citizens control it, and parents and local citizens keep an active interest in their schools, whereas when you get to the bigger school systems in the country, they are very heavily bureaucratized. They are very heavily unionized. They have enormously complex work rules and the result is the parent has no sense of power, no sense of involvement and therefore they do not pay much attention to the structure, and the schools fail.

Similarly, health-care costs have gone up throughout the eighties. Now, part of that is because we have somewhat better medicine and higher technology, but the fact is as health care has become more professionalized, more bureaucratic, more filled with red tape, as the Health Care Financing Administration has become more important than the medical doctor and more important than the hospital administrator, the total cost of health care has gone up faster than the quality and quantity of service that is being provided.

I would argue that one of the lessons of the eighties is that it is the core paradigm of the bureaucratic welfare state and the values of the left which have failed.

But in fact, the structure of bureaucracy, the structure of public government which we initially inherited from Bismarck around 1870, is a period, remember, when male clerks pushed quill pens. This is not just precomputer. It is preelectric typewriter and in fact it is pretypewriter.

Modern bureaucracy is a throwback to a world that ceased to exist in America at least 70 or 80 years ago, and yet the structure of bureaucracy is here.

You see the result, for example, in all too many veterans' hospitals, if you go and look at how long patients wait to be seen, if you look at how long the bureaucracy is willing to hold them around for red tape. If you compare that with the kind of service you would expect at Sears or K-Mart or Walmark or McDonald's or Wendy's, you ask yourself, why is there a difference?

At a trillion, \$700 billion dollars, we should be able to do better, and yet I want to argue that those of us who represent the second generation of this movement have to face up to a very powerful reality. It is not just enough to explain why the bureaucratic welfare state does not work or to explain that the values of the left do not work. We need a new paradigm. We need a new approach, a new way of solving things, and we need a lot of local examples to help us solve them.

I think the paradigm is fairly straightforward. The model I would suggest is a triangle, and anybody who is watching can draw one, and I think you can follow this very clearly. Imagine a triangle. One side of that triangle is technological progress. A second side of the triangle is entrepreneurial free enterprise, and the third side of the triangle is basic American values.

Let me repeat that. On one side you write the words technological progress. On the second side you write entrepreneurial enterprise, and on the third side you write basic American values. The result is that you have described the basic things that made America work for 400 years, from the time the Founding Fathers arrived in Massachusetts, from the time the first Virginians came to Jamestown, all the way up to about 1960 or 1965, there was a way of functioning in America. Americans were willing, above and eager, to be involved. They knew that if they want out and did something, if they explored more land, if they trapped more beaver, if they grew more corn, they would be better off. That was entrepreneurial free enterprise, and you were pretty much allowed to go out and try something if you thought it would work.

When Walt Disney came up with the crazy idea of Steamboat Willie, which was a cartoon involving a mouse, he went ahead and did it, and of course

Steamboat Willie became Mickey Mouse and Walt Disney became very wealthy.

When Henry Ford had the crazy idea of inventing an assembly line for cars, he went ahead and did it.

When Orville and Wilbur Wright were sitting around their bicycle shop, they decided they would go ahead and invent the airplane, and they went ahead and did it. None of them felt they had to ask the Government's permission. None of them felt they had to apply for Government loans or contracts and none of them felt they had to submit a proposal in 19 copies and wait for 3 years for somebody to send them back an answer.

Now, that model of change is very, very important, that we encourage people to be entrepreneurs and we had a free enterprise system which rewarded them.

The second side is also very powerful. For almost all of American history, we have relied on technological progress to improve everyone's life. Poor people in America are better off today than rich people were 200 years ago because poor people have indoor plumbing, they have refrigerators, they have televisions, they have telephones, they have access to a technology which literally did not exist even if you were a king or a queen or a millionaire in 1800.

So Americans have relied for 200 years on better technology, giving everyone a better chance to live in the future.

Finally, we had what we call basic American values. Some of them are amazingly simple. You have to study to learn. You have to do your homework. You have to actually be able to pass a test. We are not just going to promote you because you look nice. You have to learn objective facts and objective reality. You have to show up for work on Mondays. You ought to save a little bit out of what you earn each week and in the long run you will save a lot. You ought to build for the future. You ought to be able to own your own home. These are basic common ideas.

One of them is honesty. One of the most frightening things I do is ask every high school class I visit, how many of them know somebody who cheats, and virtually every student raises their hand at virtually every class.

Now, you cannot compete in the world market and you cannot maintain a democracy if everybody grows up thinking it is OK to cheat. Basic honesty is a key to a free market society, because you want to know when you buy a product that it was built by an honest person, and you want to know that it is being sold to you by an honest person. You cannot just rely on the courts to protect you because you never have enough police and you

never have enough courts in a free society. You have to rely on the basic decency and the basic honesty of most citizens, and then simply use the courts and the police for the scoundrels and the criminals. So those are basic American values.

One of the reasons we came up with the idea of a triangle is that it is our idea that any good approach, any innovation, any new idea, any new solution inside the triangle beats the old paradigm of the bureaucratic welfare state in the eyes of the left.

In other words, literally when we go around the country, if 500 different school boards have 500 different new ideas, all of them fitting inside basic American values, technological progress and entrepreneurial free enterprise, maybe the answer is to let them all find out, rather than go through some long elaborate intellectual process and writing out 90 pages of justification and shipping it off to people in Washington who have never seen your town, never seen your school, never seen your child, what if we just say within very broad zones, if you local folks think it will work better, why don't you try it in health care? Why don't you try it in helping our veterans in health care? Why don't you try it in education? Why don't you try it in catching and keeping criminals locked up?

If I could summarize it, it would be a very simple concept, that if we can get in the habit of applying common sense while focusing on opportunities, that we can cut through the redtape and we can cut through the baloney and we can solve things in America very, very fast. We can have a more commonsense Pentagon that costs less money. We can have a more commonsense New York City that costs less money.

So what we are going to try to do on May 19 is have an American Opportunities Workshop available to anyone who wants to participate, broadcast by satellite to anyone who has a down link or a dish receiver or has access to a place that has a receiver.

We do not care whether you are Democrat, Republican, whether you are a libertarian or what your background is. We do not care that you have any particular interest. What we care about is the notion that you agree that for the 1990's to be successful, we have to help America change so we can prepare for the 21st century. We want to share ideas, and in particular we want to share things that work. We want to share proposals that work.

Over the next few weeks I am going to lay out a series of ideas that work. I am going to lay out a series of success stories and draw the contrast between what happens when we empower Americans and allow them to develop new ideas and when we encourage them to find new solutions and how

much they can change things, how much they can improve things if only we trust the American people to use that kind of good commonsense.

My hope is that by seeing real success stories, not by hearing theories, not by hearing ideology, not by hearing general rhetoric, but by hearing case after case after case of good news about America, on opportunities that work, of insights that are helpful, of projects that have applied entrepreneurial free enterprise or technological progress or basic American values, or all three, that folks will decide that this is an idea whose time has come.

□ 1830

Maybe it is time to launch the second generation of a movement that has already changed America but has a long way to go. Maybe it is time to develop commonsense, focus, and opportunities, and maybe it is time to develop 21st-century citizenship by getting people to focus on new solutions for the 1990's.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

First of all, I want to say that I congratulate the gentleman for taking this special order and talking about something that I think is extremely important to all of us, and that is to take a look at the future.

Here on the floor of Congress, the gentleman from Georgia well knows, we either have the problem of the budget or savings and loans or child care, the social security tax, whatever the issue may be, and we do not have enough time to look at the long-range problems that this country is faced with. So I welcome the gentleman's initiatives.

I serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I have for a long time been interested in what is America going to look like in the 21st century. What is the world going to look like in the 21st century?

When we have a chance to talk with people from around the globe, I think we have broken it down to three main pillars in the 21st century, and I think the gentleman has really touched on those pillars.

It is interesting that most of the problems, or many of the problems, we face here on the floor of Congress deal with this third pillar, the gentleman from Georgia, and that is our traditional values. When we take a look at what is happening in the savings and loan industry, it is costing us now some projected \$500 billion, half a trillion dollars when this price tag is all finished. Why? Because of dishonesty to a great degree in the industry. When we take a look at our budget, why do we have a huge budget deficit?

Basically because we have a lot of waste, fraud, and abuse, and so if we just got back to that one traditional value of honesty, half of the problems we are faced with on the floor of Congress would be resolved.

I congratulate the gentleman for his initiative.

The question I am going to have is: How do we get there from here? Yes, we have to get back to the basic values on honesty, the work ethic and the like. I hope on May 23 we can get some ideas from people around the country.

We would be surprised, and I always am whether I speak in the Midwest or the Far West or wherever, basically people are concerned about these very issues today. Yes, we know the liberal welfare state is dead just like Marx and Engels are dead in the Soviet Union. But how does one change the system? How does one get back to the fundamental values? That is the key issue.

I salute the gentleman from Georgia for leading the initiative in that regard.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for participating. I will say, first of all, that it is May 19, a Saturday.

The point the gentleman made, and I know he served on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and he was one of the persons involved in warning us about the dangers of the savings and loan problem. Of course, there is an example whereby having the bureaucratic welfare state step in and claim that it was doing the regulating and claim that it was doing the supervising when it was not, thousands of people lost their savings, and taxpayers are going to lose something like \$50 billion to \$100 billion by the time it is done. It is a failure of the welfare state to be able to deliver on what is promised, because anytime there is a race between a crook and a bureaucrat, the crook has a lot bigger incentive to stay up at night figuring out how to win. The bureaucrat says, "It is 5 o'clock, I will go home." The crook hangs around for another couple hours trying to figure out how to get that extra million dollars.

I believe it was one of the millionaires who probably, I think, did not go to jail who went bankrupt who had 49 Rolls Royces in his garage at the time that he collapsed, one just knows looking at that that in a free-market environment where we had a much tougher self-regulating environment and did not rely on the bureaucracy as much, that no sound, prudent banker would have trusted that guy, because they would have seen him riding around town in another Rolls Royce, and they would have said, "Wait a second, he is living too high on the hog."

I would cite an idea that I think the gentleman brought up in meetings that I have been in, and that is the

notion that we ought to have a risk-based insurance fee, that if we truly had a private insurance that was covering one's deposit in the way that if they were depositing it at a bank or a savings and loan that had high-risk loans, they would have to pay a higher insurance premium than if one were depositing in a bank or savings and loan that was investing in more prudent loans.

Just the act of suddenly having a sliding scale for risk would suddenly change the pattern, but what we did for a long time in response to the Depression is we insured every loan equally. We insured it no matter how dump the banker of the savings and loan manager, how big the risk, how foolish the way they were lending money.

Let me say one last thing, because the gentleman really reminded me of this when he talked about his own efforts to go out and to learn around America.

One of the purposes of putting this workshop together and of launching the second generation of the movement is to say that, frankly, we think that 90 to 95 percent of the new ideas or the new solutions are out in America. They are not in Washington, DC. They are out in a small town, they are out in a city council, they are out in a school board, not at Harvard or Stanford.

We think it is very important to develop an approach where people send us good ideas, send us success stories, and our real job here, I think, is to serve, in a sense I think, to broadcast the good news and broadcast the successes around the country and recognize that maybe Washington has more to learn from America than America has to learn from Washington.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I want to fully associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and commend him for not only this special order but the American Opportunity Society Program on May 19 and for helping to provide some of the answers for how we get to the next century, as our colleague from Wisconsin was just inquiring.

I look forward to working with the gentleman over the course of this year and in the years to come to achieve these goals.

Mr. GINGRICH. I was going to say in closing that the American Opportunities concept and the American Opportunities Workshop is nonpartisan. We are very eager to have anybody of any background who has new ideas and new approaches or things that they think will work so that we can have the kind of successful, educated

and healthy and prosperous America all of us want in the 21st century.

I would urge any of my colleagues or any of their constituents who are interested to contact my office. We are going to try to really work to develop the best set of new ideas in these special orders and to develop an approach that allows us in Washington to learn from the rest of America. I look forward very much to working with my colleagues in the next few weeks.

CALL FOR A NEW NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, this Nation needs a new national security strategy. The need arises in part because of the successes of the strategy of containment that has served us so well for four decades. It also arises because the single-minded pursuit of containment of communism, however necessary, has left the Nation ill-prepared to cope with developments in the world that have little to do with communism.

In many ways the present period is comparable to the months immediately after World War II. In 1945, there was much joy because the war had been won. The cry throughout the country was "bring the boys home"—and we did. However, the future at that time was uncertain. Little did we realize the great strategic threat which Stalin's Russia would assume.

Today, there is much happiness in the West. The momentous events of Eastern Europe in the last half of 1989 have signalled the end of the cold war. As in 1945, the call has gone out to cut the defense budget. Once again, however, the future is unclear. Before we disarm I believe it would be better to assess the threats we face before we arbitrarily slash our defenses.

In my remarks today I will discuss the issues and problems that a new strategy must address, the timing and responsibility for the development of the new strategy, and my intention to propose legislation that will ensure development of the national military component of a new national security strategy.

Mr. Speaker, the confident, steadfast defense of democratic, constitutional, Western values by this nation, its allies, and its friends, has resulted in a victory every bit as significant as our victories in World War I and World War II earlier in this century. Our heavily burdened citizens, who gave so much in faraway places such as Korea and Vietnam and who dedicated immense portions of their national wealth to the struggle, deserve a respite. They deserve the luxury of

time to ponder and enjoy the magnificent affirmation by the Eastern bloc of the preeminence of human rights and human dignity over totalitarian collectivist ideology.

But there is little time for this country to luxuriate in its success even though the hard times on which the Communist regimes have fallen have diminished the expansionist threat that has for so long overshadowed international relations. That conclusion was confirmed by United States and allied officials in their discussions with a delegation I led to Europe in early January.

I rise on this occasion to call the attention of this body and the Nation as a whole to the sudden necessity for a rethinking of our national security strategy precipitated by the altered position of the Soviet Union and the liberating events in Eastern Europe. The international political landscape has changed but the dangers inherent in traversing that landscape have by no means disappeared.

STRATEGIC PROBLEMS

Let me hasten to add that the altered Eastern Bloc, although the proximate cause for rethinking our national strategy, by no means is the only reason for doing so. A new national security strategy must comprehend a number of developments that are changing the world in which this nation exists and pursues its interests. A review of some of the most significant of these developments in itself makes the case for the development of a new national security strategy.

A new strategy must cope with a Soviet Union that may remain a great power with great power interests or, on the other hand, could self-destruct. It must take into account a range of possibilities from replacement of President Gorbachev and reassertion of conservative Communist control to the other end of the spectrum, nationalist insurrections, civil war, and even the dissolution of the Soviet state. Considering the vast nuclear arsenal possessed by the Soviet Union, a civil war is almost as frightening to contemplate as a return to totalitarian rule. I wholeheartedly agree with the recent warning sounded by Adm. William Crowe, former JCS Chairman, when he said that:

Four times in the last century we have entered major wars unprepared because we failed to fund defense properly in peacetime.

The specter of instability also looms over Eastern Europe Yugoslavia and the former Soviet satellites are economically as well as politically bankrupt. Italian officials recently told the delegation I led to Europe that they fear a resurgence of old rivalries and regional conflicts engendered by the loosening of communism's grip.

The economic and political integration of Europe, and the concomitant

arrangements for European security, must be factored into a new U.S. strategy. How will the United States respond to the rationalization of European economic arrangements set for 1992? What role should the United States play in the emerging pan-European political arrangements? Some would counsel that the United States should heed George Washington's advice and resist further foreign entanglements. Yet, the Italians told my delegation that European political integration is impossible without a continued U.S. presence in Europe, and strong U.S. leadership. And George Kennan, the chief architect of the now successful containment strategy, recently asserted that the United States "must be actually involved in designing a new European security framework." What, then, is the appropriate level of U.S. forces in Europe? A high ranking American Commander in Europe told my delegation that he believes United States forces can be reduced to 50 percent of their current levels if the ongoing Conventional Forces in Europe [CFE] negotiations are, in the end, successful. He warned against a piecemeal approach to such significant reductions and urged that a coherent strategy be developed and implemented.

The approach of the United States toward German reunification must be a part of a new U.S. strategy. West Germany, whether divided as at present or reunified in some fashion with East Germany, must remain democratic and aligned with the West at all costs. How can this be accomplished while assuaging historic concerns of the Soviet Union? Further, how will our policy affect the concerns our Western allies have toward a unified Germany? For many on the European continent, memories of 1914 and 1939 are still vivid and frightening.

A new strategy must deal with the Pacific as well as the Atlantic. In the economic sense, Japan is a superpower. Our strategic focus on the threat posed by the Soviet Union as it developed into a co-equal military superpower blinded us to the potential threat to our economic security posed first by the Japanese and increasingly by other Asia economic powers—and potentially by the European Economic Community. Containment of Soviet expansionism, with its strong military component, proved to be a successful strategy vis-a-vis a militarily aggressive superpower. We have developed no comparable strategy to compete with economically aggressive powers such as Japan and increasingly, Korea, Taiwan and Singapore. And we must.

A new strategy must anticipate the consequences of rapidly increasing military power in countries throughout the world. Nuclear and chemical proliferation, in conjunction with the spread of ballistic missile and other

technologies, afford the potential for countries like Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran, India, Brazil, and China, whose military power was formerly limited in global terms, to figure on the world scene.

At the other end of the spectrum, a new strategy must cope with the conditions that foster or facilitate the many forms of low intensity conflict, including terrorism. This Nation's concentration on large-scale wars has left it sadly deficient in capabilities to conduct special operations.

The United States must develop a strategy that recognizes the Nation's dependence on other parts of the world for vital resources. It has been obvious for many years that the time would come when the United States could no longer depend on domestic sources for the raw materials to serve its industrial capacity. The time has come and gone. We need a strategy that recognizes that access to oil and other resources is a vital interest of the United States.

If the challenges to the Nation's security are as much economic and technological as they are military, we need a strategy that equips the Nation with the capacities to meet the varied threats. That means devoting the necessary resources and attention to improving the educational system in our country. It means refurbishing the transportation and communication infrastructure so necessary for increased industrial productivity. It means nurturing and revitalizing a massive, aging, industrial base. Finally, it means cultivating new technologies that hold the key to future prosperity.

A new national security strategy must address threats to all mankind that transcend national borders. Narcotics trafficking and environmental damage, though very different menaces, threaten our security and that of all nations.

DEVELOPING A NEW NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

The preceding list of factors that must be taken into account in developing a new national security strategy suggests the vast scope of the undertaking. What is called for is no less an effort than that expended in the fundamental reassessment of the Nation's direction that took place in the period between 1946 and 1949. In 1946 Winston Churchill sounded the challenge in his famous "Iron Curtain" speech at Fulton, MO. The challenge was met by the United States, under the leadership of President Truman, by the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan and the NATO alliance.

Thus, we ask the questions: How much time do we have? Whose responsibility is it to develop the strategy? What role should the Congress play?

How much time do we have? In my view, we have between 12 and 24

months to develop a new national security strategy. That will afford time for recent developments in the Eastern bloc to play out, for us to ascertain for certain whether cold war battles have been won, or whether the war itself is over. As I indicated at the outset, I believe the cold war is over. But it could be replaced by an equally unstable, threatening situation in the Eastern bloc or elsewhere.

Developing a new strategy within the next 2 years will also allow time for the West to conclude a first conventional arms control agreement that will be in our favor, whatever our emergent strategy. General Galvin, the NATO allied commander in Europe, emphasized to our delegation earlier this month that the agreements coming to fruition in Vienna this year will require destruction of over 90,000 Eastern bloc weapons while Western countries will only be required to destroy approximately one-tenth that number. Ambassador Woolsey, the U.S. Representative to the Conventional Forces in Europe [CFE] negotiations, emphasized the importance of "locking in" an agreement so that: First, the military equipment to be taken out of service will be destroyed; and second, unprecedented verification protocols will be accepted by both sides, thus increasing the likelihood of compliance by all parties.

Both Galvin and Woolsey emphasized that the United States should not "get ahead" of the negotiations and announce unilateral reductions of United States forces in Europe. That could have a domino effect on other Western countries. Ambassador Woolsey suggested that with cooperation on all sides a first conventional arms reduction agreement could be reached by the end of the year. Consequently, the United States has at least that long to develop a new national military strategy.

But momentum is building toward a second conventional arms control agreement to follow quickly on the heels of the first. The second agreement could cut United States forces in Europe in half.

And yet a third, final, CFE negotiation with even deeper cuts is being discussed. Before the second and third agreements are negotiated, the United States should have decided upon the European component of its new strategy. Thus, in my view, we have no more than 24 months maximum to develop the new national security strategy.

In the meantime, this year, I believe we should heed the advice of Senator NUNN, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, that any cuts in the defense budget should be in rough proportion to the reduction in the threat against the United States and its NATO allies by the Warsaw Pact. However, we must remember that this

is a stop-gap measure, not an acceptable permanent solution.

Whose responsibility is it to develop a new strategy? The Packard Commission in 1986 called for the development of an integrated national security strategy. The Commission's recommendations were endorsed by President Reagan who subsequently issued a National Security Memorandum directing that they be implemented.

The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986—of which I was one of the principal framers—included a provision drafted by Senator WARNER and sponsored in this body by Representative McEWEN that requires the President to develop and submit a national security strategy to the Congress. Following is the relevant excerpt from the Goldwater-Nichols Act:

Section 104. (a)(1) The President shall transmit to Congress each year a comprehensive report on the national security strategy of the United States (hereinafter in this section referred to as a "national security strategy report").

(2) The national security strategy report for any year shall be transmitted on the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget for the next fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) Each national security strategy report shall set forth the national security strategy of the United States and shall include a comprehensive description and discussion of the following:

(1) The worldwide interests, goals, and objectives of the United States that are vital to the national security of the United States.

(2) The foreign policy, worldwide commitments, and national defense capabilities of the United States necessary to deter aggression and to implement the national security strategy of the United States.

(3) The proposed short-term and long-term uses of the political, economic, military, and other elements of the national power of the United States to protect or promote the interests and achieve the goals and objectives referred to in paragraph (1).

(4) The adequacy of the capabilities of the United States to carry out the national security strategy of the United States, including an evaluation of the national power of the United States to support the implementation of the national security strategy.

(5) Such other information as may be necessary to help inform Congress on matters relating to the national security strategy of the United States.

(e)(1) The Secretary shall include in his annual report to Congress under subsection (c)—

(A) a description of the major military missions and of the military force structure of the United States for the next fiscal year;

(B) an explanation of the relationship of those military missions to that force structure; and

(C) the justification for those military missions and that force structure.

(2) In preparing the matter referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take into consideration the content of the annual national security strategy report of the President under section 104 of the National Security

Act of 1947 for the fiscal year concerned.

What role does Congress play? The Goldwater-Nichols Act merely codified what is implied in our form of government. The President is responsible in the first instance for proposing national security strategy. The Congress, however, shares the responsibility for ensuring that the Nation has a coherent national security blueprint. And the Congress must be a partner in the development of strategy; it must participate in the final formulation. Otherwise, the resources for implementing the strategy may not be made available by the legislative branch.

Consequently, my call today is for the President to set in motion the necessary mechanism in the executive branch to develop and propose a new national security strategy. I hope that my call will be echoed by the leadership of both houses of the Congress. Congress must insist that our Government recognize the dawn of a new era in world politics and the concomitant requirement for a new national security strategy. The Iron Curtain, of which Churchill spoke in 1946, is falling. It has turned into a shroud that cloaks the Communist system. But the sunrise of a new era may show a revival of ancient rivalries and unprecedented international turmoil. The new era may be as unpredictable as the patterns in a kaleidoscope. Uncertainties are the order of the day.

DEVELOPING THE MILITARY COMPONENT OF A NEW NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

With respect to national military strategy, I believe that the Congress can and should do more than merely issue a call that the President may or may not heed. Fortunately, the Goldwater-Nichols Act established a new mechanism within the Department of Defense that Congress can insist be employed.

The Department of Defense has not developed a long-range plan that relates military strategy to the diminishing resources to be allocated to defense in the coming years. Instead of basing projected cuts on an integrated, coherent strategy that is based on the dollars that will likely be available for defense in the coming years, the Department, according to press reports, has apparently gone through a series of budget drills in which the DOD Comptroller asks the services what they could cut if their budgets were reduced 3 percent or 5 percent or X percent in each of a number of future years. The result, if this is the process being followed, will inevitably be four separate, independent, uncoordinated answers, based on very different service military strategies, designed to protect the weapons and missions of most interest to each service but not necessarily of greatest military value to the United States.

There has been a chorus of criticism of the DOD process. House Armed Services Committee Chairman LES ASPIN stated in a speech late last year that absence of a coherent strategic plan would make any DOD proposed budget very vulnerable on the Hill. Senator NUNN criticized the budget cut drills for not being based on an assessment of the threat that could serve as the starting point for revised defense plans.

I think both chairmen and the many other critics of a piecemeal approach are right on the mark. With all due respect, the Comptroller of the Office of the Secretary of Defense is commonly, and accurately, referred to as a "bean counter." He performs a necessary valuable function. But he is hardly the official to link force structure to strategic objectives and plans for their attainment.

The Goldwater-Nichols Act places responsibility on the JCS Chairman. Fortunately, the Goldwater-Nichols Act established a new mechanism for developing military strategy and relating that strategy to the resources to be allocated to defense. In that act Congress reshaped the position of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, making him the principal military advisor to the President and Secretary of Defense. The new law placed responsibility on the JCS Chairman to perform the long-range fiscally realistic planning that is apparently missing in DOD. The Chairman is made responsible in the act for the following strategy-related activities.

Preparing strategic plans in accordance with "resource levels projected by the Secretary of Defense to be available" during the period covered by the plan.

Advising the Secretary on the extent to which the program recommendations and budget proposals of the military departments, defense agencies, and other DOD organizations conform with the priorities in strategic plans and with the priorities the Chairman recommends for the requirements identified by the combatant commands.

Submitting to the Secretary of Defense alternative program recommendations and budget proposals that conform to the Secretary's fiscal guidance and with the priorities established by the Chairman; first, in strategic plans; and second, for the combatant command requirements.

Advising the Secretary on the extent to which the manpower programs and policies of the Armed Forces conform with the Chairman's strategic plans.

Assessing military requirements for defense acquisition programs.

Conducting net assessments to determine the capabilities of the Armed Forces of the United States and its allies as compared with those of their potential adversaries.

Overseeing the activities of the combatant commands.

Serving as the spokesperson for the commanders of the combatant commands.

Unfortunately, in my view, the JCS Chairman and his Joint Staff have not achieved what the framers of the Goldwater-Nichols Act intended. True, the Chairman has apparently become a close personal advisor of the Secretary of Defense. No doubt he has provided his views on the major issues in the defense budget. Reportedly, he has even submitted strategic concept papers developed in the joint arena. But this is far different from engaging the Chairman and Joint Staff as an institution in developing and recommending to civilian authorities a coherent, long-range strategic plan, or alternative plans, tied to resource levels established by the Secretary of Defense. The Goldwater-Nichols Act envisioned a massive, institutional, joint military undertaking. It would inevitably result in recommended tradeoffs among the services, a prospect that, however unpalatable to the military officers serving in joint positions, must be accomplished.

Let me make clear, however, that the failure to implement fully the Goldwater-Nichols strategic responsibilities of the Chairman is not entirely, or even preponderantly, the fault of the joint military institutions. As Representative ASPIN and others have pointed out, the Pentagon has so far failed to seek an integrated, coherent strategic blueprint for the reduction and realignment of U.S. military forces. Instead of attempting to develop such a plan, each service was asked what it would cut if the defense budget were reduced a certain percentage for the next 5 years. The fact is that civilian leaders in the Defense Department have overlooked the key strategic role assigned to the JCS Chairman.

That strategic role is closely linked in the Goldwater-Nichols Act to the acquisition of weapons. But the otherwise excellent defense management review, though it addresses acquisition reform at length, fails to recognize the responsibility of the Chairman to tie acquisition of military weapons and equipment to long-range strategic priorities. One of the most frequent criticisms of the weapons and equipment procured by the Department of Defense is that their military purpose, mission, or task is not clearly defined. The most recent example is the B-2 bomber, a program that I support wholeheartedly. The controversy over its mission, and how that mission fits into both U.S. nuclear and U.S. conventional strategy, has made the B-2's path through the congressional process unnecessarily difficult. Another example is the two aircraft carriers presently under construction. What will be

their mission within the strategy dictated by a smaller U.S. force structure? The point is that the first "acquisition" question that must be asked is: What military task will the proposed weapon system or equipment perform in accordance with U.S. strategic plans? Thus, a strategic blueprint should be the starting point for decisions about affordable acquisitions.

We are all familiar with the Pentagon's Planning, Programming and Budgeting System, the PPBS. For years, close observers of the Pentagon have pointed out that the first "P"—Planning—is a silent "P". That is, the planning that should guide programming and budgeting is weak or nonexistent. The Goldwater-Nichols Act sought to strengthen the silent "P" by making the JCS Chairman responsible for linking strategic planning to programming and acquisition.

Needed legislation: I believe that Congress should call upon the JCS Chairman to employ the full potential of his legislative responsibilities to develop a coherent, realistic strategic plan, or set of alternative plans, for consideration by the Secretary of Defense and his principal officials, the President, and the Congress. To develop legislation requiring the Chairman to exercise his strategic responsibilities will be a complicated undertaking. I intend to consult with my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee in drafting and introducing the legislation. Following is an outline of what I have in mind:

The JCS Chairman would be given a planning top line and a set of planning assumptions. For example, the top line might be a defense budget of \$275 billion in fiscal year 1996—in 89 dollars—and \$250 billion in fiscal year 2000. The assumptions for this top line might include a greatly reduced Soviet threat as a result of stringent strategic and conventional arms control agreements and at least 6 months warning time of a Soviet buildup that might lead to hostilities.

The JCS Chairman might be asked to propose alternative strategic plans based on other top lines related to more pessimistic and more optimistic assumptions. The Packard Commission recommended that he be responsible for several alternative strategic plans each year based on a range of top lines.

Each of the plans would necessarily include the missions of each of the services, their manpower, force structure, and major acquisitions during the planning period.

To develop the strategic plans the JCS Chairman would obtain inputs from the unified and specified commanders—by law he is their spokesman and he oversees them—and from

the services. It is the service connection that may have dissuaded the JCS Chairman from exercising his planning responsibilities to the fullest in the past. Neither he nor the Joint Staff leaders welcome making trade-offs among the services that might result in a recommendation to cut the Army, say, far more than the Navy or to reshape the Air Force close air support mission in favor of the Army.

The recommendations contained in the JCS Chairman's plan—or plans—should serve as the basis for deliberation by civilian administration officials and the Congress. As modified, they would become the basis for a fiscally realistic 5-year defense plan.

THE NEED FOR JOINT MILITARY STRATEGISTS

In concluding my remarks, I want to put into perspective my call for the joint military institutions—the JCS Chairman and his Joint Staff—to develop and propose to civilian authorities and the Congress the military component of the new national security strategy.

A little over 2 years ago I made a series of speeches in this body intended to call attention to the necessity for the Department of Defense to turn its attention to the development of military strategists. Those speeches were prompted by my belief that the Nation was no longer producing outstanding strategists of the caliber of George Marshall, Douglas MacArthur, Omar Bradley, Ernest King, Chester Nimitz, Hap Arnold, and Maxwell Taylor. Our military leadership, I insisted, must be capable of grasping the significance to our national security of the increasingly rapid succession of changes that characterize the national and international scene. Furthermore, in order to respond to a world in turmoil, military strategists must possess the experience, intellectual skills, and unique talents required to shape, and continually reshape, long-range military plans and the force structure required to implement those plans.

By placing the initial responsibility for developing and proposing military strategy where it belonged, squarely on the shoulders of the JCS Chairman supported by his Joint Staff, the Goldwater-Nichols Act made it imperative that any deficiencies in the number and qualifications of military strategists be corrected quickly. And the act contained provisions requiring revitalization of the professional military school system that, if implemented properly, should solve the problem. As chairman of the newly formed panel on military education, I undertook to ensure that those Goldwater-Nichols Act provisions were properly implemented. That task continues today.

Little did I realize 2 years ago that it would be necessary for the Department of Defense to initiate a fundamental reassessment of U.S. military strategy before the decade ended.

There has been insufficient time for changes in the professional military education system to bear fruit in increasing the pool of highly qualified military strategists. I can only hope that military school officials and others who appeared before our panel were right when they asserted that many competent military strategists have been educated and are available to fill key positions. We shall see soon enough if the Joint Staff is capable of developing fiscally constrained long-range strategic plans that fashion the various services' missions and force structures in terms of overall national objectives rather than on the basis of allocating to each service its share of the defense pie.

In my view, the Nation not only desperately needs a new national military strategy, it desperately needs for the joint institutions to work in initiating that strategy. Former Secretary of Defense Laird recently joined the chorus of voices calling for a new military strategy. He went on to warn, however, that neither the military services nor the Congress are capable of developing such a strategy. He is right. The joint military institutions must propose a new military strategy, or alternative strategies, to civilian officials. And first the executive branch, and then the Congress must participate in finally shaping a new national military strategy.

I close with a description of the worst thing and the best thing that could happen in attempting to fulfill the Nation's need for a new military strategy.

The worst thing that could happen would be to follow the advice advanced by one Army general recently. Indicating that the Army is ready and willing to take its allocated cuts, the general asked only that the Army be left alone to implement the reductions as that service sees fit. If his advice were heeded—and that is the implication of the Department of Defense's individual budget drills with each service—the coming "build down" would yield four smaller versions of today's services, designed by their individual leaderships to maximize service interests rather than to work together in accomplishing national military missions.

The best thing that could happen, on the other hand, would be for a JCS Chairman to shoulder the mantle of George Marshall and lead in the development of an integrated national military strategy that serves as a blueprint for integrating the four services, in the words of the National Security Act of 1947, into "an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces."

Let us, as Members of Congress, urge the development of that integrated national military strategy. If it is forthcoming, let us determine to participate to the fullest to make it come to pass

as a reality. When this is accomplished, we can say that we have served our Nation and world peace well in our time.

□ 1900

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON].

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman, many times when a special order is taken, there are very few people on the floor of the House, but many of the Members listen to their offices, as I have been doing, to your remarks, as I was signing mail.

I could not let the gentleman finish without joining the gentleman in his request for a policy. As Members know, we work very closely. I chair the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation. One of the things that we have before Members this year, as the gentleman well knows, are the decisions to be made on where those cuts are going to be. Without a policy, how can those decisions be made in a proper manner?

Therefore, I think that what all Members are trying to ask and request is that that policy be defined, so that when we make those decisions, this Member in his capacity, looking forward to the long-term training, and the schooling that our military personnel will get, and I in my responsibility with the personnel, where we are going and what is enough, what is too much. However, more important in the environment we are in, what is too little.

Therefore, let me join with the gentleman on his remarks in the thrust of his special order this evening, and the fact that we do need a policy before we make those decisions.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for her remarks. I am fortunate enough to be a member of her Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation. I know of the gentlewoman's deep concern for the men and women of our armed services, for the national security of our Nation. We need that blueprint.

As I see it right now today, we are about where we were in the last months of 1945, possibly the early months of 1946 when we brought the boys home from Europe. We had won the war. We had won the war in Japan as well. At that time, we reduced our troop strength to some 70,000 in Europe. It was at that time that the Yalta agreement accords between Stalin and Roosevelt and Churchill were breached by Stalin and in essence, Eastern Europe was grabbed by the Soviet Union. We sat there unable to do anything.

I think that we need a policy blueprint, coming from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, through his Secretary of Defense, through the President, to the Congress, so we can respond just as the U.S. Congress responded to Harry Truman and his Secretary of Defense in 1947 with the Truman doctrine, in 1947 again with the Marshall plan, and the following year, 1948 with the NATO Alliance. That was born as the result of a policy.

As the gentlewoman knows, it worked. It worked through those years. That is what we need, the restructuring. We need that blueprint, that guideline, and as of this moment I am fearful we do not have it.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield. I want to join with the gentleman on this special order.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BENTLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WOLF, for 60 minutes, on January 25.

Mr. BALLENGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, each day on January 25, 30, 31, and February 6 and 7.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, each day on January 29, 30, 31, and February 1.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BUSTAMANTE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FAUNTROY, for 60 minutes, on January 30.

Mr. OWENS of New York, for 60 minutes, each day on January 29 and 30.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BUSTAMANTE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 60 minutes, January 30, 1990.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BENTLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. BALLENGER.
Mr. LEWIS of California in two instances.

Mr. EMERSON in two instances.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. GREEN.

Mrs. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. GINGRICH in two instances.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. TAUKE.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONIOR in three instances.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. MRAZEK.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. KASTENMEIER.

Mr. BATES.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Ms. OAKAR in two instances.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. FAZIO in two instances.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. RAY.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

Mr. CONYERS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

[Inadvertently omitted from the Congressional Record of Tuesday, January 23, 1990]

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1949. An act to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit parties engaged in collective bargaining to bargain over the establishment and administration of trust funds to provide financial assistance for employee housing; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1998. An act entitled the "Medicaid Long-Term Care Demonstration Project Waiver Act of 1989; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 1999. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the administrative procedures of the National Commission on Responsibilities for Financing Postsecondary Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 25, 1990, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[Submitted Jan. 23, 1990]

2316. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the revised final OMB sequester report to the President and Congress for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 901 (H. Doc. No. 101-128); to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

[Submitted Jan. 24, 1990]

2317. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the contract award report for the period January 1, 1990, to February 28, 1990, pursuant to U.S.C. 2431(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2318. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles estimated to cost \$50 million or more (Transmittal No. 90-17), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 118; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2319. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-137, "Protection of Children from Exposure to Drug-related Activity Amendment Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2320. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-114, "Public School of Law Amendment Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2321. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-119, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 1445, S.O. 88-152, Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2322. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-120, "Closing of a Portion of 42nd Street, N.W., S.O. 86-89, and Modification of the Highway Plan for a Portion of 42nd Street, N.W., S.O. 87-51, Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2323. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-121, "Closing of a Portion of Windom Place, N.W., S.O. 87-450, Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2324. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-122, "Closing of a Portion of Talbert Street, S.E., S.O. 88-44, Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code

Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2325. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-123, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 1046, S.O. 88-106, Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to the D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2326. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-124, "D.C. Substance Abuse Treatment and Prevention Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2327. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-128, "Closing, Dedication, and Designations of Streets, and Closing of Public Alleys, in or adjacent to Squares 5040, 5041, and 5066, S.O. 88-212, Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2328. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-129, "Law Enforcement Amendment Act of 1989" and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2329. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-130, "Bias-Related Crime Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2330. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-131, "Authorization to Enter the Interstate Corrections Compact Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2331. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-132, "Conveyance of Real Property Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2332. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-133, "Water Pollution Control Act of 1984 Amendment Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2333. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-134, "D.C. Regional Interstate Banking Act of 1985 Amendment Temporary Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2334. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-135, "Interference With Medical Health Care Facilities Temporary Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2335. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-136, "D.C. Public Assistance Act of 1982 Conforming Amendments Amendment Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2336. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-139, "Housing Production Trust Fund Board Amendment Temporary Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2337. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-140, "D.C. Codification Amendment Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2338. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-141, "Child Support Guideline Amendment Temporary Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2339. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-142, "D.C. Regional Interstate Banking Act of 1985 Amendment Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2340. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-143, "D.C. Disability Compensation Adjustment Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2341. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-144, "D.C. Solid Waste Management and Multi-Material Recycling Act of 1988 Amendment Temporary Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2342. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-145, "Non-Union Employee Compensation System and Pay Schedule Effective Date Amendment Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2343. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-146, "Retired Police Officer Redeployment Amendment Act of 1989," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2344. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 8-148, "Disposal of District Owned Surplus Real Property Amendment Act of 1989," pursuant to D.C. Code Section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2345. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the second "Annual Report to Congress—NASA Progress on Superfund Implementation in Fiscal Year 1989," pursuant to Public Law 99-499, section 120(e)(5) (100 Stat. 1669); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2346. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$69 million (Transmittal No. 90-17), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2347. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Turkey for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$30 million (Transmittal No. 90-11), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2348. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting

the fiscal year 1989 annual report on the operation of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2795b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2349. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting an addendum to the listing of all outstanding letters of offer to sell any major defense equipment for \$1 million or more; an addendum to the listing of all letters of offer that were accepted, as of September 30, 1989, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2350. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting quarterly reports of the listing of all outstanding letters of offer to sell any major defense equipment for \$1 million or more, for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2351. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, transmitting the annual report of the agency's activities under the Freedom of Information Act, calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2352. A letter from the Director, Communications and Legislative Affairs, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission's activities in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2353. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the annual report of the board's activities in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act, calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2354. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report with respect to actions taken to recruit and train Indians to qualify them for positions subject to Indian preference; the annual report on actions taken to place non-Indians employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in other Federal agencies, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 472a(d); jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Post Office and Civil Services.

2355. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting a report on the fiscal year 1988 Safety Enforcement Program performance of the FAA, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 308 nt.; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Appropriations.

2356. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting BLM's monthly status report of timber sales, December 1, 1989, pursuant to Public Law 101-121, section 318(h) (103 Stat. 750); jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2357. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting BLM's monthly status report of timber sales, January 1, 1980, pursuant to Public Law 101-121, section 318(h) (103 Stat. 750); jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALLENGER:

H.R. 3878. A bill to extend for 5 years the existing suspension of duty on machines designed for heat-set stretch texturing of continuous man-made fiber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. PEASE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. McEWEN):

H.R. 3879. A bill to authorize Overseas Private Investment Corporation programs for Czechoslovakia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MOODY, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BATES, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CONNIT, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. OAKAR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SAIKI, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 3880. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve Medicare benefits with respect to hospice care, screening mammography, in-home respite care, and home health services; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3881. A bill to require payment of interest on excess Medicare premiums collected as a result of delayed implementation of the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Repeal Act of 1989 and the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DURBIN:

H.R. 3882. A bill to amend the compensation for work injuries provisions of title 5, United States Code, to require that members of, or applicants for membership in, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who are injured or incur illness or disease are fully informed of their rights and responsibilities under such provisions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 3883. A bill to extend for a 2-year period the temporary reduction of the column 2 rate of duty on certain large offset printing machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3884. A bill to temporarily reduce the column 2 rate of duty on certain paper cutting machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILER (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. SHARP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

H.R. 3885. A bill relating to the treatment and disposal of solid waste, authorizing States to regulate solid waste in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 3886. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to clarify that States, instrumentalities of States, and officers and employees of States acting in their official capacity, are subject to suit in Federal court by any person for infringement of patents, and that all the remedies can be obtained in such suit that can be obtained in a suit against a private entity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 3887. A bill to reduce temporarily the rate of duty on certain machine tools that are the product of East Germany; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIN:

H.R. 3888. A bill to allow a certain parcel of land in Rockingham County, VA, to be used for a child care center; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 3889. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the termination of the Veterans' Educational Assistance Program and to extend the 10-year delimiting period for certain Vietnam veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAUKE (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 3890. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the period of Medicare hospice benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend to a period of 38 consecutive days the period of continuous home health services under the Medicare Program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 3892. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the applicability of duties upon certain aspects of the foreign repair of vessels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 3893. A bill to repeal the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. FISH):

H.J. Res. 463. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20, 1990, through May 26, 1990, as "National Water Recreation Safety Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the

President should exercise his authority under existing law and consistent with the 1975 Bilateral Trade Agreement in immediately moving to extend most-favored-nation trading status, and should seek to offer other such means of indirect economic assistance to Romania as an expression of confidence in the Romanian people and their new government, and to reward, promote, aid, and assist the Romanian people in their struggle for independence and freedom; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding adequate funding for long-term health care services provided through the Medicare and Medicaid Programs; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. ARCHER):

H. Res. 307. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Ways and Means in the 2d session of the 101st Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MRAZEK introduced a bill (H.R. 3894) for the relief of Banfi Products Corp.; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MRAZEK:

H. Res. 308. Resolution referring the bill (H.R. 3894) for the relief of Banfi Products Corp. to the chief judge of the U.S. Claims Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 37: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 44: Mr. FEIGHAN and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 56: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 92: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BONIOR, and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 93: Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 101: Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 145: Mr. NOWAK and Mr. GRAY.

H.R. 158: Mr. OBOY.

H.R. 164: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 173: Mr. MADIGAN.

H.R. 201: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 216: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 303: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 377: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 393: Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 446: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 467: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 509: Mr. MILLER of Ohio and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 567: Mr. WISE and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 638: Mr. BATES.

H.R. 761: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 855: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 933: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. ANNUNZIO.
 H.R. 993: Mr. SABO.
 H.R. 1008: Mr. ROE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BENNETT, and Mrs. KENNELLY.
 H.R. 1024: Mr. DREIER of California.
 H.R. 1046: Mr. DORNAN of California.
 H.R. 1068: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 1074: Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 1092: Mr. STUDDS.
 H.R. 1095: Mr. AuCOIN and Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.
 H.R. 1109: Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1136: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROE, Mr. JAMES, and Mrs. BOXER.
 H.R. 1150: Mr. NELSON of Florida.
 H.R. 1317: Mr. MONTGOMERY and Mr. PAL-LONE.
 H.R. 1360: Mr. ESPY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. ROE, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
 H.R. 1390: Mr. RHODES and Mr. ARMEY.
 H.R. 1436: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1457: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. HILER.
 H.R. 1494: Mr. GLICKMAN.
 H.R. 1565: Mr. SHUMWAY.
 H.R. 1675: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 1691: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. ANDERSON, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 1693: Mr. MACHTEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2121: Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE.
 H.R. 2139: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BLAZ, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. GEJDENSON.
 H.R. 2192: Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. CRAIG.
 H.R. 2222: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Ms. SNOWE.
 H.R. 2269: Mr. WATKINS.
 H.R. 2290: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. SHAW.
 H.R. 2335: Mr. FOGLIETTA.
 H.R. 2336: Mr. KOSTMAYER.
 H.R. 2460: Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. CONDIT.
 H.R. 2584: Mr. PARKER, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SABO, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FROST, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. WYLLIE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ASPIN, and Mr. BENNETT.
 H.R. 2585: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. OWENS of New York.
 H.R. 2596: Mr. FEIGHAN and Mr. FAUNTROY.
 H.R. 2608: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Ms. SNOWE.
 H.R. 2648: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. ROSE.
 H.R. 2700: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. ROTH.
 H.R. 2754: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEREN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr.

LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LONG, Mr. McCDAN-LESS, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MACHTEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PARRIS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHULZE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WISE, and Mr. WILSON.
 H.R. 2761: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HENRY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. VENTO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
 H.R. 2837:
 Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.
 H.R. 2838: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 2852: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BATES, Mr. SCHROEDER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MINETA.
 H.R. 2870: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 2956: Mr. STARK, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. AuCOIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FUSTER, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. YATES, Mr. CROCKETT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Ms. LONG, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WISE, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.
 H.R. 3004: Mr. SMITH of Vermont.
 H.R. 3043: Mr. FRANK and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 3079: Mr. SCHUETTE.
 H.R. 3083: Mr. FRENZEL and Mr. GINGRICH.
 H.R. 3120: Mr. WALSH, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. SCHEUER.
 H.R. 3122: Mr. SANGMEISTER and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 3123: Mr. DIXON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. YATES, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 3158: Mr. PALLONE and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.
 H.R. 3167: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. CRAIG.
 H.R. 3220: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 3247: Mr. ROSE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ECKART, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. BATES.

H.R. 3270: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. LEATH of Texas.
 H.R. 3276: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. JAMES.
 H.R. 3319: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 3325: Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 3370: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 3386: Mr. KOSTMAYER.
 H.R. 3413: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
 H.R. 3422: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HANCOCK, and Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 3471: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 3480: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. BATEMAN.
 H.R. 3483: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 3484: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, and Mr. ROE.
 H.R. 3501: Mr. ATKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. PARKER.
 H.R. 3509: Mr. EVANS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LONG, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. HUCKABY.
 H.R. 3512: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. WISE, and Mr. EVANS.
 H.R. 3517: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. BATES.
 H.R. 3526: Mr. ESPY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 3555: Mr. ECKART, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 3561: Mr. ESPY, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. HOPKINS.
 H.R. 3575: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. FAUNTROY.
 H.R. 3621: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. McGRATH.
 H.R. 3622: Mr. ESPY.
 H.R. 3623: Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. SCHUETTE.
 H.R. 3652: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROE, Mr. PENNY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BAKER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GEREN, Mr. STALLINGS,
 Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
 H.R. 3654: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. OWENS of Utah.
 H.R. 3673: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HILER, and Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 3684: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 3685: Mr. HUCKABY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. ROGERS.
 H.R. 3693: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RINALDO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WISE, Mr.

GALLO, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

H.R. 3699: Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PARKER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 3721: Mr. WILSON and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3757: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 3779: Mr. WISE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 3818: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 3832: Mr. MAZZOLI.

H.R. 3869: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. DIXON.

H.J. Res. 81: Mr. COX and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.J. Res. 82: Ms. LONG, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. BOSCO, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. DYSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. COURTER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. WASLH, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GRANDY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. RAY.

H.J. Res. 255: Mr. GRADISON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PA-

NETTA, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. COURTER.

H.J. Res. 287: Mr. PETRI.

H.J. Res. 345: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GEREN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KYL, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.J. Res. 367: Mr. BLAZ, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Ms. LONG, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. HOPKINS, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RAY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.J. Res. 436: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WOLPE, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SKAGGS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SABO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GEREN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. FROST.

H.J. Res. 441: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LENT, Mr.

RITTER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. CARPER.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. PACKARD.

H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. STARK, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. AU COIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FUSTER, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OLIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. YATES, Mr. CROCKETT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FROST, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Ms. LONG, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WISE, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Con. Res. 178: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BRENNAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COX, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H. Res. 206: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BLILEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. OWENS, of Utah, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. BROWN of California.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2273: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 3456: Mr. SAXTON.